

t&tclark

T&T CLARK COMPANION TO THE SEPTUAGINT



EDITED BY
JAMES K. AITKEN

B L O O M S B U R Y

The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint

Forthcoming titles in this series include:

T&T Clark Companion to the Atonement, edited by Adam J. Johnson

T&T Clark Companion to the Doctrine of Sin, edited by Keith L. Johnson and David Lauber

T&T Clark Companion to Liturgy, edited by Alcuin Reed

Titles already published include:

T&T Clark Companion to Methodism, edited by Charles Yrigoyen Jr

T&T Clark Companion to Reformation Theology, edited by David M. Whitford

T&T Clark Companion to Augustine and Modern Theology, edited by C. C. Pecknold and Tarmo Toom

T&T Clark Companion to Nonconformity, edited by Robert Pope

The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint

Edited by
James K. Aitken

Bloomsbury T&T Clark
An Imprint of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc

B L O O M S B U R Y
LONDON • NEW DELHI • NEW YORK • SYDNEY

Bloomsbury T&T Clark

An imprint of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc

Imprint previously known as T&T Clark

50 Bedford Square	1385 Broadway
London	New York
WC1B 3DP	NY 10018
UK	USA

www.bloomsbury.com

BLOOMSBURY, T&T CLARK and the Diana logo are trademarks of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc

First published 2015

© James K. Aitken, 2015

James K. Aitken has asserted his rights under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988, to be identified as editor of this work.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or any information storage or retrieval system, without prior permission in writing from the publishers.

No responsibility for loss caused to any individual or organization acting on or refraining from action as a result of the material in this publication can be accepted by Bloomsbury Academic or the author.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

ISBN: HB: 978-0-56703-134-1
ePDF: 978-0-56720-007-5

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

T&T Clark companion to the Septuagint / edited by James K. Aitken.

pages cm -- (Bloomsbury companions)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-567-03134-1 (hardback)

I. Bible. Old Testament. Greek--Versions--Septuagint. I. Aitken, J. K. (James Keltie), 1968- editor. II. Title: T & T Clark companion to the Septuagint.

BS744.T26 2015

221.4'8--dc23

2014031654

Typeset by Forthcoming Publications Ltd (www.forthpub.com)

Contents

Preface	ix
Abbreviations	xi
List of Contributors	xxi
Glossary	xxvii

Introduction

I. What Is the Septuagint?	1
II. Why Study the Septuagint?	2
III. Origins and Location	3
IV. Translations after the Pentateuch	4
V. Text and Manuscripts	5
VI. Editions of the Septuagint	6
VII. Translations	7
VIII. Current Scholarship	8
IX. Resources	11

Genesis

<i>Mark W. Scarlata</i>	13
-------------------------	----

Exodus

<i>Alison Salvesen</i>	29
------------------------	----

Leviticus

<i>Anssi Voitila</i>	43
----------------------	----

Contents

Numbers	
<i>T.V. Evans</i>	58
Deuteronomy	
<i>Larry Perkins</i>	68
Joshua	
<i>Michaël N. van der Meer</i>	86
Judges	
<i>Philip E. Satterthwaite</i>	102
Ruth	
<i>Eberhard Bons</i>	118
1–2 Kingdoms (1–2 Samuel)	
<i>Philippe Hugo</i>	127
3–4 Kingdoms (1–2 Kings)	
<i>Timothy Michael Law</i>	147
1–2 Chronicles (<i>Paraleipomena</i>)	
<i>Roger Good</i>	167
1 Esdras	
<i>Hector M. Patmore</i>	178
2 Esdras	
<i>R. Glenn Wooden</i>	195
Esther and Additions to Esther	
<i>Cameron Boyd-Taylor</i>	203
Judith	
<i>Jeremy Corley</i>	222
Tobit	
<i>Loren Stuckenbruck and Stuart Weeks</i>	237
1 Maccabees	
<i>David S. Williams</i>	261

2 Maccabees <i>Frank Shaw</i>	273
3 Maccabees <i>Sara Raup Johnson</i>	292
4 Maccabees <i>Robert J.V. Hiebert</i>	306
Psalms <i>James K. Aitken</i>	320
Prayer of Manasseh (<i>Odes 12</i>) <i>James K. Aitken</i>	335
Proverbs <i>James K. Aitken and Lorenzo Cuppi</i>	341
Ecclesiastes <i>James K. Aitken</i>	356
Canticles (Song of Songs) <i>Jean-Marie Auwers</i>	370
Job <i>Claude E. Cox</i>	385
Wisdom of Solomon <i>James K. Aitken</i>	401
Sirach (Ecclesiasticus) <i>Benjamin G. Wright</i>	410
Psalms of Solomon <i>Daniele Pevarello</i>	425
The Minor Prophets <i>Jennifer M. Dines</i>	438
Isaiah <i>Abi T. Ngunga and Joachim Schaper</i>	456

Contents

Jeremiah <i>Andrew G. Shead</i>	469
Baruch <i>Daniel Ryan</i>	487
Lamentations <i>Kevin J. Youngblood</i>	500
Epistle of Jeremiah <i>Benjamin G. Wright</i>	520
Ezekiel <i>Katrin Hauspie</i>	528
Daniel (Old Greek and Theodotion) <i>R. Timothy McLay</i>	544
The Additions to Daniel <i>Lawrence Lahey</i>	555
<i>Index of References</i>	568

Preface

I have long felt the need for a handy summary of features for each of the Septuagint books, for easy consultation by both Septuagint experts and biblical scholars or students more generally. I did not realize the immensity of the task of producing one, however. While the field of Septuagint is now more popular than ever, there are still few experts for many of the books of the Septuagint. The diversity of approaches in the field and the questions pertaining to the translations are reflected in this volume, although some areas are better covered in the scholarship than others. This Companion serves as much as a guide to our present stage of knowledge as an indicator of areas still poorly covered. It has required contributors to gather original evidence for some sections or else to indicate the limitations of what has been covered so far. The intention has been to be representative of the field and to include as contributors those connected with all the main schools or geographic areas of Septuagint studies. As far as possible, the aim has also been to involve the younger generation of scholars to comment on the established positions and indicate future paths of investigation.

The idea for the Companion began in discussion with Georgina Brindley, formerly of T&T Clark, and has been subsequently overseen enthusiastically by Dominic Mattos and Miriam Cantwell. Duncan Burns has proven to be a careful and untiring copy-editor. I am grateful to the many contributors who have made suggestions along the way and who

Preface

have been patient with the editing. The Faculty of Divinity has been a home for my research, and I continually draw from the inspiration of colleagues there. The Fund Managers of the Faculty of Divinity provided a grant for editorial assistance, and I am grateful to Greg Lanier for his attentive eye and his advice on many aspects of the work.

JKA
Cambridge
January, 2014

Abbreviations

Septuagint References

Gen.	Genesis
Exod.	Exodus
Lev.	Leviticus
Num.	Numbers
Deut.	Deuteronomy
Josh.	Joshua
Judg.	Judges
Ruth	Ruth
1 Sam. (LXX 1 Kgdms)	1 Samuel (LXX 1 Kingdoms)
2 Sam. (LXX 2 Kgdms)	2 Samuel (LXX 2 Kingdoms)
1 Kgs (LXX 3 Kgdms)	1 Kings (LXX 3 Kingdoms)
2 Kgs (LXX 4 Kgdms)	2 Kings (LXX 4 Kingdoms)
1 Chron.	1 Chronicles (LXX <i>Paralipomena</i> 1)
2 Chron.	2 Chronicles (LXX <i>Paralipomena</i> 2)
Ezra	Ezra
Neh.	Nehemiah
Est.	Esther
Job	Job
Ps. (pl. Pss.)	Psalms
Prov.	Proverbs
Eccl.	Ecclesiastes
Cant.	Canticles (Song of Songs)
Isa.	Isaiah
Jer.	Jeremiah
Lam.	Lamentations
Ezek.	Ezekiel
Dan.	Daniel
Hos.	Hosea

Abbreviations

Joel	Joel
Amos	Amos
Obad.	Obadiah
Jon.	Jonah
Mic.	Micah
Nah.	Nahum
Hab.	Habakkuk
Zeph.	Zephaniah
Hag.	Haggai
Zech.	Zechariah
Mal.	Malachi
1 Esd.	1 Esdras
2 Esd.	2 Esdras
Tob.	Tobit
Jdt.	Judith
Add. Est.	Additions to Esther
Wis.	Wisdom of Solomon
Sir.	Sirach
Bar.	Baruch
Ep. Jer.	Epistle of Jeremiah
Song 3 Childr.	Song of the 3 Children (Additions to Daniel)
Bel	Bel and the Dragon (Additions to Daniel)
Pr. Man.	Prayer of Manasseh (Odes)
1 Macc.	1 Maccabees
2 Macc.	2 Maccabees
3 Macc.	3 Maccabees
4 Macc.	4 Maccabees

New Testament

Mt.	Matthew
Mk	Mark
Lk.	Luke
Jn	John
Acts	Acts of the Apostles
Rom.	Romans
1 Cor.	1 Corinthians
2 Cor.	2 Corinthians
Gal.	Galatians
Eph.	Ephesians
Phil.	Philemon
Col.	Colossians
1 Thess.	1 Thessalonians
2 Thess.	2 Thessalonians
1 Tim.	1 Timothy
2 Tim.	2 Timothy

Tit.	Titus
Phlm.	Philemon
Heb.	Hebrews
Jas	James
1 Pet.	1 Peter
2 Pet.	2 Peter
1 Jn	1 John
2 Jn	2 John
3 Jn	3 John
Rev.	Revelation

Other Sources

<i>Ann.</i>	Tacitus, <i>Annals</i>
<i>Ant.</i>	Josephus, <i>Antiquities of the Jews</i>
<i>Apion</i>	Josephus, <i>Against Apion</i>
<i>Apoc. Zeph</i>	<i>Apocalypse of Zephaniah</i>
<i>Apol.</i>	Justin Martyr, <i>Apologies</i>
<i>Aristob.</i>	Aristobulus
<i>Art.</i>	Artapanus
<i>Bacch.</i>	Euripides, <i>The Bacchae</i>
<i>Barn.</i>	<i>Epistle of Barnabas</i>
<i>b. 'Erub.</i>	Babylonian Talmud, <i>'Erubin</i>
<i>b. Sanh.</i>	Babylonian Talmud, <i>Sanhedrin</i>
<i>Cat.</i>	Cyril of Jerusalem, <i>Catechetical Lectures</i>
CD	The Damascus Document
<i>Comm. Eccl.</i>	Jerome, <i>Commentary on Ecclesiastes</i>
<i>Comm. Isa.</i>	Eusebius, <i>Commentary on Isaiah</i>
<i>Comm. John</i>	Origen, <i>Commentary on John</i>
<i>Comm. Matt.</i>	Eusebius, <i>Commentary on Matthew</i>
<i>Conf.</i>	Philo, <i>Confusion of Tongues</i>
<i>Dem.</i>	Demetrius the Chronographer
<i>Deus.</i>	Philo, <i>That God Is Unchangeable</i>
<i>Div. Vesp.</i>	Suetonius, <i>Divine Vespasian</i>
<i>Dom. orat.</i>	Cyprian, <i>The Lord's Prayer</i>
<i>Ep. Afr.</i>	Origen, <i>Epistle to Africanus</i>
<i>Ep. Fest.</i>	Athanasius, <i>Epistulae festales</i>
<i>Err. prof. rel.</i>	Firmicus Maternus, <i>De errore profanarum religionum</i>
<i>Eupol.</i>	Eupolemus
<i>Ezek. Trag.</i>	Ezekiel the Tragedian
<i>Gen. R.</i>	<i>Genesis Rabbah</i>
<i>Her.</i>	Ireneaus, <i>Against Heresies</i>
<i>Her.</i>	Philo, <i>Who Is the Heir?</i>
<i>Hist.</i>	Eusebius, <i>Ecclesiastical History</i>
<i>Hist.</i>	Herodotus, <i>Histories</i>
<i>Hom. Exod.</i>	Origen, <i>Homilies on Genesis and Exodus</i>
IGR	<i>Inscriptiones graecae ad res romanas pertinentes</i>

Abbreviations

<i>j. Sanh.</i>	Jerusalem Talmud, <i>Sanhedrin</i>
<i>Jos. Asen.</i>	<i>Joseph and Aseneth</i>
<i>Jub.</i>	<i>Jubilees</i>
<i>LAB</i>	<i>Biblical Antiquities</i> of Ps.-Philo
<i>Leg. All.</i>	Philo, <i>Allegorical Interpretation</i>
<i>m. Aboth</i>	Mishnah, <i>Sayings of the Fathers</i>
<i>MAMA</i>	<i>Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua</i>
<i>Mos.</i>	Philo, <i>Life of Moses</i>
<i>Mut.</i>	Philo, <i>On the Change of Names</i>
<i>m. Yad.</i>	Mishnah, <i>Yadayim</i>
<i>Or.</i>	Origen, <i>On Prayer</i>
<i>PColZen. II</i>	<i>Zenon Papyri: Business Papers of the Third Century</i> <i>B. C. Dealing with Palestine and Egypt</i> , vol. II. Edited by W.L. Westermann, C.W. Keyes, and H. Liebesny (New York, 1940)
<i>PFouad</i>	<i>Les Papyrus Fouad I</i> . Edited by A. Bataille, O. Guéraud, P. Jouguet, N. Lewis, H. Marrou, J. Scherer and W.G. Waddell (Cairo, 1939)
<i>Plant.</i>	Philo, <i>On Planting</i>
<i>POxy</i>	<i>The Oxyrhynchus Papyri</i> . Published by the Egypt Exploration Society in Graeco-Roman Memoirs (London, 1898–)
<i>PPetr.</i>	<i>The Flinders Petrie Papyri</i> (3 vols.; Dublin, 1891–1905)
<i>PRylands</i>	<i>Catalogue of the Greek and Latin Papyri in the John</i> <i>Rylands Library, Manchester</i> (4 vols.; Manchester, 1911–1952)
<i>Ps.-Hec.</i>	Pseudo-Hecataeus
<i>Pss. Sol.</i>	<i>Psalms of Solomon</i>
<i>Re rust.</i>	Columella, <i>De re rustica</i>
<i>Scorp.</i>	Tertullian, <i>Scorpiace</i> (Antidote to the Gnostics)
<i>Sib. Or.</i>	<i>Sibylline Oracles</i>
<i>Spec.</i>	Philo, <i>Special Laws</i>
<i>Strom.</i>	Clement, <i>Stromateis</i>
<i>T. Dan</i>	<i>Testament of Dan</i>
<i>T. Jud.</i>	<i>Testament of Judah</i>
<i>T. Levi</i>	<i>Testament of Levi</i>
<i>T. Sol.</i>	<i>Testament of Solomon</i>
<i>Tg. Jon.</i>	Targum of Jonathan to the Prophets
<i>Vir. Ill.</i>	Jerome, <i>De viris Illustribus</i>
<i>War</i>	Josephus, <i>Jewish War</i>

General Abbreviations

A	Codex Alexandrinus
AASF	Annales Academiae scientiarum fennicae
AB	Anchor Bible

Abbreviations

<i>ABD</i>	<i>Anchor Bible Dictionary</i> . Edited by David Noel Freedman (6 vols.; New York, 1992)
AbrN	Abr-Nahrain
AGJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
<i>AIPHOS</i>	<i>Annuaire de l'Institut de philologie et d'histoire orientales et slaves</i>
AJEC	Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity
<i>AJP</i>	<i>American Journal of Philology</i>
AJSL	American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature
AJT	American Journal of Theology
AKWG	Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen
AnBib	Analecta biblica
AnBoll	Analecta Bollandiana
ANRW	Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt
AOAT	Alter Orient und Altes Testament
<i>APOT</i>	<i>The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English</i> . Edited by R.H. Charles (2 vols.; Oxford, 1913)
ATAT	Arbeiten zu Text und Sprache im Alten Testament
ATABh	Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen
AthANT	Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments
B	Codex Vaticanus
BBB	Bonner biblische Beiträge
<i>Bd'A</i>	<i>La Bible d'Alexandrie</i>
BETHL	Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologiarum Lovaniensium
<i>BGS</i>	G. Dorival, M. Harl, and O. Munnich. <i>La Bible grecque des Septante: du judaïsme hellénistique au christianisme ancien</i> (Paris, 1988)
<i>BHQ</i>	<i>Biblia Hebraica Quinta</i>
<i>BHS</i>	<i>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia</i>
<i>Bib</i>	<i>Biblica</i>
<i>Biblia Griega</i>	<i>La Biblia Griega Septuaginta</i> . Edited by N. Fernandez Marcos and M.V. Spottorno Diaz-Caro (3 vols.; Salamanca, 2008–2011)
<i>BIOSCS</i>	<i>Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies</i>
BIS	Biblical Interpretation Series
BKAT	Biblischer Kommentar Altes Testament
BNB	Biblische Notizen Beihefte
BWANT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament
BWAT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten Testament

Abbreviations

BZ	<i>Biblische Zeitschrift</i>
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
CAD	<i>Chicago Assyrian Dictionary</i>
CahRB	Cahiers de la Revue biblique
CATSS	Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Studies
CBET	Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology
CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
CBR	<i>Currents in Biblical Research</i>
CCSG	Corpus Christianorum: Series graeca (Turnhout, 1977–)
CEJL	Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature
CNRS	Centre national de recherche scientifique
ConBOT	Coniectanea biblica: Old Testament Series
CP	<i>Classical Philology</i>
CRBS	Currents in Research Biblical Studies
CRINT	Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum
CSCO	Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium
CSHB	Critical Studies in the Hebrew Bible
DBSup	<i>Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible</i>
DCLS	Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Studies
DJD	Discoveries in the Judean Desert
EBib	<i>Etudes bibliques</i>
ECCA	Early Christianity in the Context of Antiquity
<i>Eine Einführung</i>	F. Siegert, <i>Zwischen Hebräischen Bibel und Alten Testament. Eine Einführung in die Septuaginta</i> (Münsteraner judaistische Studien 9; Münster, 2001)
ETL	<i>Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses</i>
ExpT	<i>Expository Times</i>
FAT	Forschungen zum Alten Testament
GRBS	<i>Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies</i>
GELS	T. Muraoka, <i>A Greek–English Lexicon of the Septuagint: Chiefly of the Pentateuch and the Twelve Prophets</i> (Louvain, 2002)
HALOT	Koehler, L., W. Baumgartner, and J.J. Stamm, <i>The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> . Translated and edited under the supervision of M.E.J. Richardson (4 vols.; Leiden, 1994–1999)
HBS	<i>Herders Biblische Studien</i>
HeyJ	<i>Heythrop Journal</i>
H-R	E. Hatch and H.A. Redpath, <i>A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (Including the Apocryphal Books)</i> (Oxford, 1897; repr. Graz, 1954)
HS	<i>Hebrew Studies</i>

HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
HSS	Harvard Semitic Studies
HThKAT	Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Alte Testament
<i>HTR</i>	<i>The Harvard Theological Review</i>
<i>HUCA</i>	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
HUCM	Monographs of the Hebrew Union College
ICC	International Critical Commentary
IDB	Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible
IOSCS	International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies
JAL	Jewish Apocryphal Literature Series
<i>JAOS</i>	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
JBLMS	Journal of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
JBS	Jerusalem Biblical Studies
JBTh	Jahrbuch Biblische Theologie
<i>JECS</i>	<i>Journal of Early Christian Studies</i>
<i>JJS</i>	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
<i>JNSL</i>	<i>Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages</i>
Joüon-Muraoka	P. Joüon, <i>A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew</i> . Translated and revised by T. Muraoka (Subsidia biblica 27; 2 vols.; revised ed.; Rome, 2006 [1991])
JSHRZ	Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit
<i>JSJ</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism</i>
JSJSup	Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism
<i>JSOT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
JSOTSup	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series
<i>JSP</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha</i>
JSPSup	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series
<i>JSQ</i>	<i>Jewish Studies Quarterly</i>
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
KAT	Kommentar zum Alten Testament
KB	L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, <i>Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti libros</i> (repr.; Leiden, 1985)
LBS	Library of Biblical Studies
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
LD	Lectio Divina
LEH	<i>A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint. Revised Edition</i> . Edited by J. Lust, E. Eynikel, and K. Hauspie (Stuttgart, 2003)
<i>Les devanciers</i>	D. Barthélemy, <i>Les devanciers d'Aquila</i> (VTSup 10; Leiden, 1963)
LHBOTS	Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies

Abbreviations

LSJ	Liddell, H.G., R. Scott, H.S. Jones, and R. McKenzie, <i>A Greek–English Lexicon. With a Revised Supplement</i> . Edited by P.G.W. Glare (Oxford, 1996)
LXX.D	<i>Septuaginta Deutsch: Das griechische Alte Testament in deutscher Übersetzung</i> . Edited by W. Kraus and M. Karrer (Stuttgart, 2009)
MSU	Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens
MT	Masoretic Text
NA-28	<i>Novum Testamentum Graece / Nestle-Aland, Based on the Work of Eberhard and Erwin Nestle</i> . Edited by Barbara and Kurt Aland (28th rev. ed.; Stuttgart, 2012)
NASB	New American Standard Bible
NAWG	Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen
NCBC	New Cambridge Bible Commentary
<i>Neot</i>	<i>Neotestamentica</i>
NETS	<i>A New English Translation of the Septuagint</i> . Edited by A. Pietersma and B. Wright (Oxford, 2007)
NIB	New Interpreter’s Bible
<i>Notes</i>	
<i>Notes Genesis</i>	J.W. Wevers, <i>Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis</i> (Atlanta, GA, 1993)
<i>Notes Exodus</i>	J.W. Wevers, <i>Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus</i> (Atlanta, GA, 1990)
<i>Notes Leviticus</i>	J.W. Wevers, <i>Notes on the Greek Text of Leviticus</i> (Atlanta, GA, 1997)
<i>Notes Numbers</i>	J.W. Wevers, <i>Notes on the Greek Text of Numbers</i> (Atlanta, GA, 1998)
<i>Notes Deuteronomy</i>	J.W. Wevers, <i>Notes on the Greek Text of Deuteronomy</i> (Atlanta, GA, 1995)
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
NTTS	New Testament Tools and Studies
OBO	Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis
ÖBS	Österreichische biblische Studien
OG	Old Greek
OL	Old Latin
OLA	Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta
OTE	Old Testament Essays
OTL	Old Testament Library
<i>OTP</i>	<i>Old Testament Pseudepigrapha</i> . Edited by J.H. Charlesworth (2 vols.; New York, 1983)
<i>OTS</i>	<i>Oudtestamentische Studiën</i>
<i>PAAJR</i>	<i>Proceedings of the American Academy of Jewish Research</i>
PFES	Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society

PG	<i>Patrologia graeca</i> [= <i>Patrologiae cursus completus: Series graeca</i>]. Edited by J.-P. Migne (162 vols.; Paris, 1857–1886)
PL	<i>Patrologia latina</i> [= <i>Patrologiae cursus completus: Series latina</i>]. Edited by J.-P. Migne (217 vols. Paris, 1844–1864)
PSBA PSI VI	<i>Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology Papiri greci e latini (Pubblicazioni della Società Italiana per la ricerca dei Papiri greci e latini in Egitto)</i> , vol. VI. Edited by G. Vitelli (Florence 1917, 1920)
PTA	Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen
PVTG	Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti graece
PW	<i>Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft</i> (Pauly-Wissowa)
RAC Rahlfs-Hanhart	<i>Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum Septuaginta</i> . Edited by A. Rahlfs. 2nd ed., checked and corrected by R. Hanhart (Stuttgart, 2006.) (First edition: A. Rahlfs, <i>Septuaginta: Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes</i> [2 vols.; Stuttgart, 1935])
RB	<i>Revue biblique</i>
REG	<i>Revue des études grecques</i>
RevQ	<i>Revue de Qumran</i>
RHPR	<i>Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses</i>
RSR	<i>Recherches de science religieuse</i>
RThom	<i>Revue thomiste</i>
RTL	<i>Revue théologique de Louvain</i>
SAIC	Studies in the Aramaic Interpretation of Scripture
SBB	Stuttgarter biblische Beiträge
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series
SBLEJL	Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and Its Literature
SBLMS	Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series
SBLSCS	Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies
SBLSS	Society of Biblical Literature Semeia Studies
SBLTT	Society of Biblical Literature Texts and Translations
SBS	Stuttgarter Bibelstudien
Schürer	E. Schürer, <i>The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135)</i> . Revised by G. Vermes, F. Millar and M. Goodman (3 vols.; Edinburgh, 1973–1987)
ScrB	<i>Scripture Bulletin</i>
SJOT	<i>Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament</i>
SPap	<i>Studia papyrologica</i>
STAC	Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah

Abbreviations

STL	Studia Theologica Lundensia
Swete, <i>OTG</i>	H.B. Swete, <i>The Old Testament in Greek According to the Septuagint</i> (3 vols.; Cambridge, 1896–1901)
Swete, <i>Intro.</i>	H.B. Swete, <i>An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek</i> (Cambridge, 1914)
TAPA	Transactions of the American Philosophical Association
TDNT	<i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i> . Edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (10 vols.; Grand Rapids, 1964–1976)
TDOT	<i>Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament</i> . Edited by G.J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren (15 vols.; Grand Rapids, 1974–2006)
TECC	Textos y Estudios ‘Cardenal Cisneros’ de la Biblia Políglota Matritense
TEG	Traditio Exegetica Graeca
<i>Text History</i>	
<i>Text Hist. Exodus</i>	J.W. Wevers, <i>Text History of the Greek Exodus</i> (Göttingen, 1992)
<i>Text Hist. Leviticus</i>	J.W. Wevers, <i>Text History of the Greek Leviticus</i> (Göttingen, 1986)
<i>Text Hist. Numbers</i>	J.W. Wevers, <i>Text History of the Greek Numbers</i> (Göttingen, 1982)
<i>Text Hist. Deuteronomy</i>	J.W. Wevers, <i>Text History of the Greek Deuteronomy</i> (Göttingen, 1978)
TGI	<i>Theologie und Glaube</i>
Thackeray, <i>Grammar</i>	H.St.J. Thackeray, <i>A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint</i> . I. <i>Orthography and Accidence</i> (Cambridge, 1909)
TLG	Thesaurus Linguae Graecae
TSAJ	Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum
TSMEMJ	Texts and Studies in Medieval and Early Modern Judaism
TU	Texte und Untersuchungen
VC	<i>Vigiliae christianae</i>
VT	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
VTSup	Supplements to <i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
W	Washington Papyrus
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZAW	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
ZKT	<i>Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie</i>
ZNW	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche</i>

Contributors

James K. Aitken is lecturer in Hebrew, Old Testament and Second Temple Studies at the University of Cambridge. He is the author of *No Stone Unturned: Greek Inscriptions and Septuagint Vocabulary* (Winona Lake, IN, 2014).

Jean-Marie Auwers is Professor at l'Université catholique de Louvain where he teaches Patristics and Biblical Greek. His publications include *L'interprétation du Cantique des cantiques à travers les chaînes exégétiques grecques* (Turnhout, 2011)

Eberhard Bons is Professor of Old Testament in the Faculté de Théologie Catholique, l'Université Marc Bloch, Strasbourg. He was a contributor to *La Bible d'Alexandrie 23/1: Les Douze Prophètes. Vol. I, Osée* (Paris, 2002), and is preparing (with J. Dines) the volume on Amos.

Cameron Boyd-Taylor is a Research Associate in The John William Wevers Institute, Trinity Western University. His publications include *Reading Between the Lines: The Interlinear Paradigm for Septuagint Studies* (Leuven, 2011).

Jeremy Corley teaches Scripture at St Patrick's College, Maynooth, Ireland. He is the author of *Ben Sira's Teaching on Friendship* (Providence, 2002) and co-editor of six essay collections.

Contributors

Claude Cox is an Adjunct Professor at McMaster Divinity College, Hamilton, Ontario. His publications include *Armenian Job: Reconstructed Greek Text, Critical Edition of the Armenian with English Translation* (Leuven, 2006).

Lorenzo Cuppi is an independent researcher in Bologna, Italy. He completed his Ph.D. in Durham on ‘Long Doublets in the Septuagint of the Book of Proverbs with a History of the Research on the Greek Translations’ (2011).

Jennifer Dines, University of Cambridge, is the author of *The Septuagint* (London, 2004) and is preparing (with E. Bons) the *Bible d’Alexandrie* volume on Amos.

Trevor Evans is a Senior Lecturer in the Department of Ancient History at Macquarie University, Sydney. He is the author of *Verbal Syntax in the Greek Pentateuch* (Oxford, 2001), and has contributed as Assistant Editor to five recent fascicules (2005–10) of the British Academy’s *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources* (ed. R.E. Latham and D.R. Howlett, 1975–2014).

Roger Good currently works as a translation consultant, teacher, and editor for Living Stream Ministry in Anaheim, California. He is the author of *The Septuagint’s Translation of the Hebrew Verbal System in Chronicles* (Leiden, 2010).

Katrin Hauspie is an independent scholar in Leuven. She is co-author with J. Lust and E. Eynikel, of *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint: Revised Edition* (Stuttgart, 2003).

Robert J.V. Hiebert is a Professor of Old Testament and the Director of the Septuagint Institute at Trinity Western University in Langley, British Columbia, Canada. He is preparing the critical edition of 4 Maccabees for the Göttingen Septuaginta series and a commentary on Genesis for the forthcoming Society of Biblical Literature Commentary on the Septuagint series, for which he also serves as a joint-editor-in-chief.

Philippe Hugo is a fellow of the *Dominique Barthélemy Institute for Text and Exegesis History of the Old Testament* at the University of Fribourg/Switzerland. He is the editor of 2 Samuel for the Göttingen Septuagint. His publications include *Les deux visages d'Elie* (Göttingen, 2006) and (with A. Schenker) *Archaeology of the Books of Samuel* (Leiden, 2010).

Sara Raup Johnson is Associate Professor at the University of Connecticut. She is the author of *Historical Fictions and Hellenistic Jewish Identity: Third Maccabees in Its Cultural Context* (Berkeley, 2004).

Lawrence Lahey is an independent scholar in Chicago. He has published widely on Jewish–Christian disputations, and especially on the *Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila*.

Timothy Michael Law is a researcher at the University of St. Andrews. He is the author of *Origenes Orientalis: The Preservation of Origen's Hexapla in the Syrohexapla of 3 Reigns* (Göttingen, 2011) and *When God Spoke Greek: The Septuagint and the Making of the Christian Bible* (New York, 2013).

Tim McLay is the author of *The OG and Th versions of Daniel* (Atlanta, 1996) and *The Use of the Septuagint in New Testament Research* (Grand Rapids, 2003). He has recently initiated a new publishing venture called The Scholar's Publisher.

Michaël van der Meer is an independent scholar in Amsterdam. He is the author of *Formation and Reformulation: The Redaction of the Book of Joshua in the Light of the Oldest Textual Witnesses* (Leiden, 2004).

Abi Ngunga serves as a minister in Scotland. He is the author of *Messianism in the Old Greek of Isaiah: An Intertextual Analysis* (Göttingen, 2013).

Contributors

Hector M. Patmore is Lecturer in Hebrew and Judaism at Cardiff University, Wales. He is the author of *Adam, Satan, and the King of Tyre: The Interpretation of Ezekiel 28:11-19 in Late Antiquity* (Leiden, 2012).

Larry Perkins is Professor of Biblical Studies at Northwest Baptist Seminary/Associated Canadian Theological Seminaries, Langley, BC, Canada. He contributed 'Exodus' to *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*. His doctoral studies focused on the Syro-hexapla tradition of Deuteronomy.

Daniele Pevarello is Assistant Professor in Early Christianity at Trinity College, Dublin. His publications include *The Sentences of Sextus and the Origins of Christian Asceticism* (Tübingen, 2013).

Daniel Ryan is a Ph.D. student researching Hasmonean history at St John's College, University of Cambridge, and the Faculty of Divinity.

Alison Salvesen is Fellow in Jewish Bible Versions at the Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, Oxford, and a University Research Lecturer at the Oriental Institute, University of Oxford. Her publications include *Symmachus in the Pentateuch* (Manchester, 1991).

Philip Satterthwaite is the Principal and Lecturer in Old Testament, Biblical Hebrew and Hermeneutics at the Biblical Graduate School of Theology, Singapore. He is the author (with J.G. McConville) of *Exploring the Old Testament*. Vol. 2, *The Histories* (London, 2007).

Mark W. Scarlata is lecturer in Old Testament/Hebrew Bible at St. Mellitus College, London. He is the author of *Outside of Eden: Cain in the Ancient Versions of Genesis 4:1-16* (London, 2012).

Joachim Schaper is Professor of Hebrew & Semitic Languages, University of Aberdeen. His publications include *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter* (Tübingen, 1995) and (co-editor with J. Carleton Paget) *The New Cambridge History of the Bible*. Vol. I, *From the Beginnings to 600* (Cambridge, 2013).

Frank Shaw is an independent scholar working in the USA. His publications include *The Earliest Non-Mystical Jewish Use of Iao* (Leuven, 2014).

Andrew Shead is the head of Old Testament studies at Moore Theological College, Sydney. His publications include *The Open Book and the Sealed Book: Jeremiah 32 and Its Hebrew and Greek Recensions* (London, 2002).

Loren Stuckenbruck is Professor at the Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, Munich. His publications include (with S. Gathercole and S. Weeks), *The Book of Tobit: Texts from the Principal Ancient and Medieval Traditions with Synopsis, Concordances, and Annotated Texts in Aramaic, Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and Syriac* (Berlin, 2004).

Anssi Voitila, Doctor of Theology (University of Helsinki), is Senior Lecturer/University Lecturer in Biblical Languages and Studies at the University of Eastern Finland. He is a participant in the project 'Changes in Sacred Texts and Traditions' (CSTT) (Center of Excellence in Research, Academy of Finland) at the University of Helsinki.

Stuart Weeks is Professor of Old Testament at the University of Durham. His publications include (with S. Gathercole and L. Stuckenbruck), *The Book of Tobit: Texts from the Principal Ancient and Medieval Traditions with Synopsis, Concordances, and Annotated Texts in Aramaic, Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and Syriac* (Berlin, 2004).

David S. Williams is Meigs Professor of Religion and Director of the Honors Program at the University of Georgia. His publications include *The Structure of 1 Maccabees* (Washington, 1999).

R. Glenn Wooden teaches Old Testament studies at Acadia Divinity College, Acadia University, in Wolfville, NS, Canada. He has his Ph.D. from the University of St. Andrews (Scotland). He translated 1 Esdras and 2 Esdras for NETS.

Contributors

Benjamin G. Wright is University Distinguished Professor at Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA. His publications include *No Small Difference: Sirach's Relationship to Its Hebrew Parent Text* (Atlanta, 1989).

Kevin J. Youngblood is an associate professor at the College of Bible and Religion at Harding University. His Ph.D. dissertation was on 'Translation Technique in the Greek Lamentations'.

Glossary

Antiochene

A revision of the Septuagint that takes its name from Lucian of Antioch (also known as the Lucianic) in the late third century C.E., but it is now recognized that the translation tradition goes back much earlier. The preference is to call it Antiochene rather than Lucianic to indicate that it is not to be attributed to one person alone.

Aquila

The name of one of the most important Jewish ‘revisers’ of the Septuagint. In the early second century C.E. he undertook a new translation of the Hebrew Bible, adhering as closely as possible to the Hebrew text in lexical consistency, syntax and word order. His method is now seen as a development of earlier attempts (such as *kaige*) to render the Hebrew precisely.

Aristeas, Letter of

Dated to the late second century B.C.E., the *Letter of Aristeas* contains the earliest account of the translation of the Septuagint. Scholars debate how far it presents reliable information, especially when its purpose appears to be to bolster the identity of the Jews in Egypt in the period.

Codex

The codex is similar to the modern book, consisting of a series of sheets folded over, usually into quires, that were bound for the pages to be turned. It is to be contrasted with the scroll, which was a series of leafs bound in a row to be unrolled. The major codices from the fourth century onwards preserve complete versions of the Septuagint and serve as important witnesses to the text.

Glossary

Hapax Legomenon (pl. -a)

A word that appears once in a source or once in the language as a whole is known as a *hapax legomenon* (Greek ‘once said’).

Hexapla

Origen in the third century produced his *Hexapla* (comprised of six columns), laying out in columns the biblical Hebrew text, the Hebrew transliterated into Greek characters, the Jewish translation of Aquila, that of Symmachus, the Septuagint, and the version of Theodotion. After Origen, versions of the Septuagint circulated that incorporated his revisions of the Greek text, producing ‘Hexaplaric’ versions of the books.

Kaige

An early revision or new translation of the Septuagint can be seen in manuscripts that are classed as *kaige*, the earliest being the Minor Prophets Scroll from Naḥal Ḥever of the first century B.C.E. Though *kaige* should be seen more as a tendency than a consistent approach, it is typified by close adherence to the Hebrew word order and by choosing standard for equivalents for Hebrew words.

Koine

The Greek language from the Hellenistic and Roman period is classified as Koine. The term does not denote the register or style of the language, but is a general term for post-classical Greek in all its forms.

Lucianic

See Antiochene.

Old Greek (OG)

The term used by scholars to designate the oldest layer of the translation recoverable. As the Septuagint can be comprised of layers of tradition and can include more than one translation for any one book, the Old Greek is seen as the earliest layer in opposition to later additions or revisions.

Old Latin (*Vetus Latina*)

The earliest Latin tradition translated from the Greek in the second century C.E. It is therefore older than Jerome’s Vulgate and comprises a series of translations into Latin, each a witness to an early Greek text that stands behind the translation.

Peshitta

The translation of the Bible into Syriac, which was largely based on a Hebrew text but also includes readings translated from Greek.

Proto-Masoretic

As the complete Hebrew Bible known to us is the Masoretic Bible of the middle ages, early partial manuscripts that have survived, such as Qumran, are divided into those that are the basis of this later version (proto-Masoretic) and those that have a divergent text.

Recension

In distinction from a revision, a recension is a new translation of work rather than one based on an earlier version.

Revision

In distinction from a recension, a revision is a modification of a translation already existing.

Semitism

A Semitism is a feature in Greek that does not conform to normal Greek idiom and seems to have been influenced by a Semitic language. These can arise from translation or from the bilingualism of an author. It is not always possible to tell whether such influence, in semantics, syntax or morphology, arises from Hebrew or Aramaic.

Source Language/Text

In translation theory the source language or source text denotes the original text that a translation is based upon. *See* Target Language/Text.

Symmachus

A second-century C.E. reviser of the Septuagint who aimed to produce a translation in elegant Greek with some degree of interpretation. His translation was included by Origen in his *Hexapla*.

Syro-Hexapla

A translation into Syriac of Origen's revised text of the Septuagint. It preserves for us Origen's text including many of his markings to indicate where the Hebrew and Greek differed.

Glossary

Target Language/Text

In translation theory the target language or target text denotes the final product of a translation, namely the language into which a translation is made or the text that is produced as a result.

Targum

The designation for the Aramaic translations of the Hebrew Bible.

Theodotion

One of the three translators from the second century C.E. included in Origen's *Hexapla*. He seems to have been the culmination of a translation tradition going back to the *kaige*.

The Three

A collective term referring to the three Greek translators or revisers of the second century C.E., Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion.

Translation Technique

A term used by scholars to designate the particular translation features characteristic of any one translator. These include the degree of consistency in translation choices, of adherence to word order, and of equivalence between elements in the source language and the target language.

Vorlage

A designation of the source text which was used as the basis of a translation. Often we do not have the actual text, but the *Vorlage* can be hypothetically reconstructed from the translation.

Vulgate

The translation of the Bible, including the New Testament and most of the Apocrypha, made by Jerome (ca. 347–420 C.E.).

Introduction

I. What Is the Septuagint?

A Companion on the Septuagint should be clear on its subject matter, the Septuagint. The definition is not as easy, however, as it might seem. On a superficial level the Septuagint is everything gathered in the most accessible one-volume edition by Rahlfs-Hanhart, the *Septuaginta*. Indeed, this Companion takes as its range all those books contained within that volume. These are Jewish translations of the canonical Hebrew Bible along with other works, conventionally called apocryphal or deuterocanonical, that are either translations or original Greek compositions. In early codices of the Bible these books were included alongside the New Testament and sometimes other works, but never with absolute consistency. There is therefore no one Septuagint, since in antiquity, as well as in different churches today, books such as 3 and 4 Maccabees or Psalms of Solomon are sometimes included, sometimes not.

The name Septuagint (Latin ‘seventy’, conventionally abbreviated to LXX) derives from the legend of seventy-two translators, six from each of the twelve tribes of Israel, called upon to translate the Pentateuch into Greek. The number seventy-two was later abbreviated to seventy (Josephus, *Ant.* 12.57). The legend, first recorded in the *Letter of Aristeas* (second century B.C.E.) and expanded upon by writers throughout history (Wasserstein and Wasserstein, *Legend*), has been questioned as historically reliable but has left us the heritage of the name. In this legend the number seventy-two applied only to the translators of the first five books of Moses, the Pentateuch—this was the Septuagint proper. The term is now loosely applied to all the books translated from Hebrew and the deuterocanonical books, although it is not a category of antiquity (see Williams, ‘Bible’, pp. 173–78).

A further problem is that there is no one Septuagint, not only in terms of the books included, but in terms of the text itself. As explained below (§ V. Text and Manuscripts), there is more than one translation into Greek for many biblical books and different versions exist in the manuscript tradition. Therefore scholars tend to distinguish the Old Greek (OG) from the LXX to indicate the first translation made from Hebrew, as far as it can be reconstructed from the evidence. The LXX is then a general designation for the Greek tradition of the Bible. In this Companion, LXX will be used for consistency to refer to the specific LXX books, reserving OG only for those cases where a clear distinction needs to be made between the earliest layer and later forms of the text.

II. Why Study the Septuagint?

As an object of study the Septuagint sheds light on a range of issues. It importantly is a witness to an early stage of the text of the Bible from which we can reconstruct the Hebrew version lying behind it (Tov, *Text-Critical*). Its text-critical value is now supported by the discovery of Hebrew manuscripts among the Dead Sea Scrolls that reflect in some cases a text similar to the one translated. At the same time, the translators made subtle modifications to the meaning of the text or chose subtle interpretations. It is therefore a witness to early biblical exegesis and the ideology of the early Jewish translators. Individual translations were also the texts used by Greek-speaking Jews and early Christians (sometimes misleadingly called ‘the first Bible of the Church’), and continued in church history as the foundations behind many bibles up to the modern era (see Hengel, *Christian; Law, When God Spoke Greek*). From a scholarly perspective it is also an important Greek document in its own right. It is the largest extant piece of Ptolemaic Greek, and one of the first works of Hellenistic Judaism (Rajak, *Translation*). For linguistic evidence it is a work of sub-literary Greek, providing a lexical resource for lesser-known Koine words (Aitken, *No Stone*). And for translation studies it is (possibly) the largest work of translation literature from antiquity, offering valuable insight for translation studies on both bilingual interference and translation technique. The Septuagint, in short, is a work that can now be seen as having relevance for numerous areas of the study of antiquity.

III. Origins and Location

There is little evidence for the origins of the Septuagint other than the contents and nature of the translations themselves. Scholars have sought to go beyond the legends of priestly translators sponsored by Ptolemy (from *Aristeas*) to determine what we may of the context and purpose, even though Jews in the early years of Ptolemaic rule are poorly attested in the sources. The translation style in the standard Greek of the Hellenistic period already indicates that the translation was unlikely to have been produced at the highest literary level for a king (Wright, ‘Letter of Aristeas’). The first books to be translated were certainly the first five books of Moses, the Pentateuch. They reflect some differences in translation technique, suggesting different translators for each book, but they also show a degree of homogeneity, implying they were all translated within a similar time and place. Consistent translation choices and similar translation techniques indicate the same approach to translation and might also imply that there was already an oral tradition of translation in which word choices had already been decided (Aejmelaeus, ‘Oral’). The influence on the translation from spoken Aramaic, the language used in Egypt in the Persian period, also suggests both an oral context in which word equivalents were already used (such as *pascha*’ for Passover; *sabbata*’ for Sabbath) and a setting within Egypt. Egyptian loan-words in Greek are very few (ἄχαι ‘reed-grass’, θῖβις ‘casket’, and οἰφέι, an Egyptian measurement; see Thackeray, *Grammar*, pp. 28, 34; Joosten, ‘Aramaic’), but combined with other Egyptian features (such as the Egyptian ibis, Lev. 11.17; Deut. 14.16) confirm this as the setting. Most presume it must have been Alexandria where scholarly activity took place, but writing and translation were fundamental to the running of the Egyptian economy and were therefore to be found in every town and village in Egypt. Jews likewise from early on are attested in papyri and inscriptions throughout Egypt. The type of Greek (Lee, *Lexical Study*, pp. 139–44; Evans, *Verbal Syntax*, pp. 263–64) and early citations of the translation indicate that the time the Pentateuch was completed is almost certainly the third century B.C.E.

The reasons for this first translation are similarly clouded in uncertainty. Suggestions have included the need for a liturgy in Greek or for the Jewish law to be intelligible to the Ptolemaic judges. No certainty can be given, but it is likely that the new generation of Jews born in Egypt

would have learnt Greek as the *lingua franca* and not have been as at home in Hebrew. The importance of Greek as a status symbol and means of social advancement in Egypt should not be underestimated either. The translators themselves had familiarity with the traditional interpretation of the Hebrew Bible (Van der Kooij, *Oracle*, pp. 112–23) but also seem to have been at home in the language of administration round about them. They use technical financial and legal terms, have familiarity with military terms too (Joosten, ‘Le milieu’), and continually reflect the world of Egypt with its agriculture and landscape.

IV. Translations after the Pentateuch

While there is some confidence in the dating and setting of the translation of the Pentateuch, little can be inferred regarding the rest of the books in the LXX. The translator of Sirach includes a preface that indicates he came from Jerusalem (presumably) to Egypt at the end of the second century (132 or 117 B.C.E.), and the translation of Esther has an epilogue, though its content is ambiguous. Otherwise we must once more work with the evidence internal to the translations. Two key indicators are used in the argument. First, potential ideological traces that could suggest a Judean provenance are used to place certain translations there rather than Egypt (such as Psalms, Isaiah, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes). These can only be tentative and the proximity of Judea to Egypt and movement between the two places (cf. Sirach translator) raise questions over whether any such traces need imply the specific location. Second, a chronology can be established of translation styles that can be used to determine relative dating. Some translations seem to presuppose others (see Minor Prophets) and certain specific techniques were introduced at a certain point. Thus, those in the *kaige* translation tradition (see below) are to be dated from the end of the first century B.C.E. or later. In sum, while the preface to Sirach implies many translations existed by the late second century B.C.E., others were not completed until as late as the first century C.E. (Canticles, Ecclesiastes, Lamentations; *BGS*, p. 97). Not just canonical works either but important texts of Second Temple Judaism were also being translated (Enoch; *Jubilees*; see Stone, *Ancient*). Debate continues on the time and place of all these translations and no one model should be imputed for each (Tov, ‘Reflections’).

V. Text and Manuscripts

As soon as a translation was complete, variants would have been introduced by copyists. We see this in the very earliest of the manuscript witnesses for the LXX. This is the same with any ancient work, but with the LXX the picture is complicated by the production of new editions already in antiquity. There was not one Septuagint, therefore, but a number of versions that have left their mark on our text and manuscripts. This had been observed in notable differences in translation style even within the same books (Thackeray, ‘Greek Translators’), but was confirmed by subsequent manuscript discoveries of different versions of translated books. Most important in this regard was the discovery of the scroll of the Minor Prophets in Naḥal Ḥever in the Judean wilderness. Dated to the end of the first century B.C.E., this scroll contains a different version of the Minor Prophets from the one known in the LXX. It is either a ‘revision’ of the LXX version or a new translation of the Hebrew (known as a ‘recension’ as opposed to a ‘revision’). This version follows the Hebrew text more closely in word order and in the consistency of its renderings of Hebrew words, and thus typifies a style of translation that adheres to the Hebrew more closely than the original LXX translators did. Barthélemy (*Les devanciers*) termed this translation style *kaige*, owing to its distinctive rendering of the two Hebrew elements of וְגַם ‘and also’ as two equivalent elements in Greek, καὶ γὰρ (*kaige*). Although Barthélemy’s view that this close representation of the Hebrew was a proto-rabbinic mode of interpretation is now disputed, he successfully showed that it laid the foundations for later translations, especially by the second-century C.E. translators Aquila and Theodotion, who produced their own translations of the Hebrew Bible. It is now recognised that the *kaige* tradition was not uniform but a developing mode of translation, since any two books displaying *kaige* features never share all the same characteristics.

The ongoing revision and new translations of the Bible have resulted in one of the most complex aspects of Septuagint study—the manuscript evidence. The chapters on individual books will explain in detail the complexities with each, but the reader may be helped by a simplified overview. First, within the oldest translation layer that we can recover, called by many the Old Greek (OG), there are already parts where newer

versions have replaced sections that have fallen out. This was clearly seen in Exodus and in the books of Kingdoms long before the actual evidence of the Naḥal Ḥever scroll came to light (Thackeray, ‘Greek Translators’). It is observable in the different styles within one translation where sections were missing in a manuscript and a scribe supplemented it by another version. Second, in some cases the OG was entirely replaced by a new version (such as the ‘Theodotion’ version of Daniel), the OG only being identified more recently in some manuscripts. Third, similar to Daniel, some books are preserved in more than one version (such as Esther or Judges) that have existed side by side.

In addition to these distinct strands in particular books, the manuscripts for all books need to be analysed and sorted as to whether they contain the earliest layer, the Old Greek, or a revision, so that the evidence can be evaluated properly. Various revisions and new translations continued into late antiquity. The second-century translator, Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion all produced new versions, and one is attributed to Lucian (known more accurately as the Antiochene version). Origen recorded in his Hexapla the text of the LXX known in his time (early third century), along with the readings of the second-century translators. This careful textual work had the unfortunate consequence that many readings from these later witnesses were added by scribes to manuscripts, with the result that the original OG is now contaminated in our witnesses by the Hexaplaric evidence. A major task, then, in LXX study is to separate in the manuscript traditions the pre-Hexaplaric data from the Hexaplaric. Those modern editions that present the full evidence from the manuscripts assist in this task.

VI. Editions of the Septuagint

There are a number of editions available for the whole Septuagint, but the most readily available is the one volume edition of Rahlfs (corrected by Hanhart, 2006). The majority of electronic editions are based upon Rahlfs’, although it is not the most reliable. Rahlf-Hanhart is a partially critical edition, incorporating Rahlfs’ judgement on preferred readings, at times prioritising some traditions that not all would agree as the best evidence. The original edition was based primarily on Vaticanus, with

corrections from Alexandrinus and Sinaiticus. The recent revision by Hanhart makes reference to some other major witnesses in the apparatus, since Rahlfs' edition had previously been limited to the main uncials and manuscript families.

Before Rahlfs, early editions of the LXX were based on just one or two MSS (for example, Walton's Polyglot of 1657). These are known as diplomatic editions, choosing one witness as a base text and providing in the apparatus readings, if at all, from other witnesses. The first major collation of manuscripts, by Holmes and Parsons, was completed in 1827. This paved the way for the significant diplomatic edition of Brooke, Mclean and Thackeray, known as the 'Larger Cambridge Septuagint' (1906–40; incomplete). As its predecessors the Cambridge Septuagint uses Vaticanus, but with a full main apparatus covering all the Greek textual evidence from manuscripts and the daughter versions (the translations from Greek into Latin, Coptic, Ethiopic, etc.). A second apparatus included containing marginal readings from the later Jewish revisions of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion preserved in the Hexapla and by patristic writers. This served as the basis for the smaller diplomatic edition by Swete (Cambridge, 1887–94).

The best critical editions are the volumes of the Göttingen Septuagint (produced by the Septuaginta-Unternehmen research centre in Göttingen), which contain an editor's restoration of the best readings and a full apparatus of manuscript evidence. In similar manner to the Cambridge Septuagint, it contains two apparatuses, one with the Greek witnesses to the text and the second with the Hexaplaric readings. These are the editions that should be used for research as they present the fullest picture of the manuscript evidence. Where volumes are not yet available for particular books, the Cambridge Septuagint provides an alternative.

VII. Translations

There are now a number of modern translations of the Septuagint. The first in English was by Charles Thomson (1808), but the one that gained currency and has been published up to the present day is that of Brenton (1844). His translation was largely based on Vaticanus, and, although useful, was deeply influenced by the Authorized Version and was

produced before advances in our understanding of LXX Greek. More recent English versions include *The Orthodox Study Bible* and an elegant rendering by King (*The Bible*). In production too is the Septuagint Commentary Series, published by Brill, which consists of facing pages of Greek text and English translation, followed by a commentary on the text. The one translation that has considered in detail the scholarly problems of translating a translation, and based as far as possible on the best editions (Göttingen where available), is NETS (see Pietersma, 'New'). It follows the style of the NRSV, where the Greek corresponds to the Hebrew, and includes helpful introductory notes to each book. An accompanying commentary is also in production.

Other European translations have also recently been produced. The German two-volume *Septuaginta Deutsch* (LXX.D) is accompanied by a commentary in separate volumes. An Italian translation of the Pentateuch, *La Bibbia dei Settanta*, was translated by Mortari (1999). A Spanish version, *La Biblia Griega*, is currently underway, under the editorship of Fernández Marcos and colleagues. Finally, in the individual commentary volumes of the French series *La Bible d'Alexandrie* (1989–) translations are provided, aiming at the sense of the Greek for an ancient reader. A one-volume edition of the Pentateuch combining the translations for those books was subsequently published (ed. Dogniez and Harl, 2001). Translation projects in other languages are also in progress or planned, including a translation into Japanese by Gohei Hata. All these translations are facilitating research into the LXX, and opening problems and questions of their own.

VIII. Current Scholarship

The field of Septuagint study is more active and varied than ever before. It is not possible to cover all the areas, but we can indicate some lines of current research. Translation theory has taken on a new prominence in recent years, and in the chapters of this book some influence from translation theory will be felt (see especially Pietersma, 'New Paradigm'; Boyd-Taylor, *Reading*). It is an important tool for determining the extent of interpretation in the translations (Wagner, *Reading*). Much more has still to be done in this area. Fundamental questions continue to occupy

the discipline too. Text criticism and the continuing publication of Göttingen volumes remains important, and the role of the Hexapla is an area of active research. The nature of the Greek of the Septuagint is an area of debate, and despite advances made in the past century, much still remains (Lee, *'A Lexical Study'*). The type of language feeds into debates on the origins of the Septuagint and the social background of the translators (e.g., Joosten, *'Le milieu'*).

As in all areas of biblical studies, reception history informs our understanding, even though the reception of the Septuagint is still a neglected area. It does, nevertheless, have important consequences for our appreciation of the nature of the LXX itself. In particular, attention has shifted from the Christian reception (Hengel, *Christian*) and use in the New Testament to the lesser-known Jewish reception (Rajak, *Translation*) and even the continuing Jewish use of Greek Bible versions (de Lange *et al.*, *Jewish Reception*; Law and Salvesen, *Greek Scripture*). This could radically change our perception of Jewish–Christian relations and of the parting of the ways. An older model of Jewish rejection of the Septuagint does not fit the evidence available. It can be seen, therefore, that an understanding of the issues in the Septuagint can inform many areas of the study of antiquity. This Companion provides a first step for those wishing to know about each book within the Septuagint. It is hoped it will not be their last step into the field.

Bibliography

- Aejmelaeus, A., 'The Septuagint and Oral Translation', in M.K.H. Peters (ed.), *XIV Congress of the International Organization of Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Helsinki, 2010* (SBLSCS 59; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013), pp. 5–13.
- Aitken, J.K., *No Stone Unturned: Greek Inscriptions and Septuagint Vocabulary* (CSHB 5; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2014).
- 'The Septuagint and Egyptian Translation Methods', in M. van der Meer (ed.), *Proceedings of the International Organization of Septuagint and Cognate Studies Congress, Munich 2013* (Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, forthcoming).
- Boyd-Taylor, C., *Reading Between the Lines: The Interlinear Paradigm for Septuagint Studies* (Leuven: Peeters, 2011).

The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint

- Brenton, L.C.L., *The Septuagint Version of the Old Testament, According to the Vatican Text, Translated into English: with the Principal Various Readings of the Alexandrine Copy, and A Table of Comparative Chronology* (2 vols.; London: Bagster, 1844).
- de Lange, N., J.G. Krivoruchko and C. Boyd-Taylor (eds.), *Jewish Reception of Greek Bible Versions: Studies in their Use in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages* (TSMEMJ 23; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009).
- Dogniez, C., and M. Harl (eds.), *Le Pentateuque: La Bible d'Alexandrie* (Paris: Cerf, 2001).
- Evans, T.V., *Verbal Syntax in the Greek Pentateuch: Natural Greek Usage and Hebrew Interference* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).
- Hengel, M., *The Septuagint as Christian Scripture: Its Prehistory and the Problem of Its Canon* (Old Testament Studies; London: T&T Clark International, 2002).
- Joosten, J., 'Le milieu producteur du Pentateuque grec', *REJ* 165 (2006), pp. 349–61.
—'The Septuagint as a Source of Information on Egyptian Aramaic in the Hellenistic Period', in H. Gzella (ed.), *Aramaic in its Historical and Linguistic Setting* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2008), pp. 93–105.
- King, N., *The Bible: A Study Bible Freely Translated* (Buxhall: Kevin Mayhew, 2013)
- Kooij, A. van der, *The Oracle of Tyre: The Septuagint of Isaiah XXIII as Version and Vision* (VTSup 71; Leiden: Brill, 1998).
- Law, T.M., *When God Spoke Greek: The Septuagint and the Making of the Christian Bible* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013).
- Law, T.M., and A.G. Salvesen (eds.), *Greek Scripture and the Rabbis* (CBThE; Leuven: Peeters Press, 2012).
- Lee, J.A.L., *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch* (SBLSCS 14; Chico: Scholars Press, 1983).
—'A Lexical Study Thirty Years On, with Observations on "Order" Words in the LXX Pentateuch', in S.M. Paul, R.A. Kraft, L.H. Schiffman and W.W. Fields (eds.), *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (VTSup 94; Leiden: Brill, 2003), pp. 513–24.
- Pietersma, A., and B.G. Wright (eds.), *NETS: A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000).
- Pietersma, A., 'A New English Translation of the Septuagint', in B.A. Taylor (ed.), *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo, 1998* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001), pp. 217–28.
—'A New Paradigm for Addressing Old Questions: The Relevance of the Interlinear Model for the Study of the Septuagint', in J. Cook (ed.), *Bible and Computer: The Stellenbosch AIBI Conference. Proceedings of the Association Internationale Bible et Informatique 'From Alph to Byte'. University of Stellenbosch 17–21 July, 2000* (Leiden: Brill, 2002), pp. 337–64.

- Rajak, T., *Translation and Survival: The Greek Bible and the Jewish Diaspora* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).
- Stone, M.E., *Ancient Judaism: New Visions and Views* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2011).
- Thackeray, H.St.J., ‘The Greek Translators of the Four Books of Kings’, *JTS* 8 (1907), pp. 262–78.
- The Orthodox Study Bible. Prepared under the Auspices of the Academic Community of St. Athanasius Academy of Orthodox Theology, Elk Grove, California* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2008).
- Thomson, C., *Holy Bible, Containing the Old and New Covenant, Commonly Called the Old and New Testament. Translated from the Greek by Charles Thomson* (4 vols.; Philadelphia: Jane Aitken, 1808).
- Tov, E., ‘Reflections on the Septuagint with Special Attention Paid to the Post-Pentateuchal Translations’, in W. Kraus and M. Karrer (eds.), *Die Septuaginta—Texte, Theologien, Einflüsse; 2. internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 23.-27.7. 2008* (WUNT 252; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), pp. 3–22.
- The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (2nd ed.; Jerusalem Biblical Studies 8; Jerusalem: Simor, 1997).
- Wagner, J.R., *Reading the Sealed Book: Old Greek Isaiah and the Problem of Septuagint Hermeneutics* (FAT 88; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; Waco: Baylor University Press, 2013).
- Wasserstein, A., and D.J. Wasserstein, *The Legend of the Septuagint: From Classical Antiquity to Today* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006).
- Williams, P.J., ‘The Bible, the Septuagint, and the Apocrypha: A Consideration of their Singularity’, in G. Khan and D. Lipton (eds.), *Studies on the Text and Versions of the Hebrew Bible in Honour of Robert Gordon* (Leiden: Brill, 2012), pp. 169–80.
- Wright, B.G., ‘The Letter of Aristeas and the Question of Septuagint Origins Redux’, *Journal of Ancient Judaism* 2 (2011), pp. 303–25.

IX. Resources

a. Editions

- Rahlfs, A., *Septuaginta. Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes edidit Alfred Rahlfs. Editio altera quam recognovit et emendavit Robert Hahnhart* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006).
- Swete, H.B., *The Old Testament in Greek According to the Septuagint* (3 vols.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1891–1912).

b. Introductions

- Cimosa, M., *Guida allo studio della bibbia greca (LXX). Storia – lingua – testi* (Roma: Società Biblica Britannica & Forestièra, 1995).
- Dines, J.M., *The Septuagint* (London: T&T Clark International, 2004).
- Dirival, G., M. Harl and O. Munnich, *La Bible grecque des Septante* (Paris: Cerf, 1988).
- Fernández Marcos, N., *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Versions of the Bible* (Leiden: Brill, 2000).
- Jellicoe, S., *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968).
- Jobes, K.H., and M. Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books; Carlisle: Paternoster, 2000).
- Law, T.M., *When God Spoke Greek: The Septuagint and the Making of the Christian Bible* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013).
- Siegert, F., *Zwischen Hebräischer Bibel und Altem Testament: eine Einführung in die Septuaginta* (Münsteraner judaistische Studien 9; Münster: Lit, 2001).
- Swete, H.B., *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1900).

c. Bibliographies

- Brock, S.P., *A Classified Bibliography of the Septuagint* (ALGhJ 6; Leiden: Brill, 1973).
- Dogniez, C., *Bibliography of the Septuagint (1970–1993)* (VTSup 60; Leiden: Brill, 1995).

d. Lexicons

- Hatch, E., and H.A. Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint: And the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament—Including the Apocryphal Books* (2nd ed.; 2 vols. in 1; Includes Muraoka, ‘Hebrew/Aramaic Index’; Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 1998)
- Lust, J., E. Eynikel and K. Hauspie (eds.), *Greek–English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (rev. ed.; New York: American Bible Society, 2004).
- Muraoka, T., *A Greek–English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (Leuven: Peeters, 2009).
- Taylor, B.A., *The Analytical Lexicon to the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1994).

e. Grammars

- Conybeare, F.C., *Grammar of Septuagint Greek: With Selected Readings, Vocabularies, and Updated Indexes* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1980).
- Thackeray, H.St.J., *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek: According to the Septuagint*. Vol. 1, *Introduction, Orthography, and Accidence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909; reprint G. Olms, 1978).

Genesis

Mark W. Scarlata

Editions

(a) Standard Greek Editions

Göttingen, vol. I, *Genesis* (Wevers, 1974).

Cambridge, vol. I.1, *Genesis* (Brooke and McLean, 1906).

Rahlfs-Hanhart, vol. I, pp. 1–85.

Swete, vol. I, pp. 1–103.

(b) Modern Translations

NETS (McLay, 2007), pp. 1–42.

LXX.D (Prestel and Schorch, 2009), pp. 3–55.

Bd'A 1 (Harl *et al.*, 1986).

La Biblia Griega, vol. I (Fernández Marcos *et al.*, 2008), pp. 37–140.

Hebrew (Zipor, 2006).

I. General Characteristics

The Old Greek translation of Genesis maintains a very close lexical and syntactical relationship to the Hebrew parent text. The translator was not slavishly dependent on the Hebrew, but did, at times, depart from the original to produce renderings for stylistic and, perhaps, theological reasons. Some scholars contend that the LXX was translated according to an interlinear model whereby the translators rendered the Hebrew with strict correspondence and produced a Greek version that would be difficult to understand apart from the original text. Hiebert emphasises the precise representations by the Greek translator of Genesis and argues for a significant degree of dependence on the Hebrew text despite

periodic departures from typical translation patterns (NETS, p. 1). Although we would not compare LXX Genesis with the slavish and meticulous renderings of Aquila, it does maintain a strong correspondence with the Hebrew—but not without offering independent renderings where the text might have proved difficult to translate.

Since LXX Genesis, in most instances, offers a close translation of the Hebrew, Wevers argues that the translators were likely influenced by the fact that they were working on a canonical text. The translators tried to express what ‘they believed God intended to say to his people’ and so composed a balanced translation that would respect the holiness of Scripture while also appealing to a Greek-speaking Alexandrian Jew (*Notes Genesis*, p. xii). Though we cannot be certain of the religious convictions of the translators, Wevers is right to highlight the fact that LXX Genesis reflects a thoughtful translation that still allowed for the removal of contradictions—as well as interpretive additions—where the Hebrew text remained difficult. He concludes that the Greek can stand on its own as a worthy composition and portrays the translator as one who carefully rendered a sacred text but was not afraid to translate freely when needed.

While affirming with Wevers that some discrepancies between LXX Genesis and the MT might have been due to interpretation or clarification, Hendel contends that the Greek consistently represents a literal translation of the Hebrew. He argues that LXX Genesis is characterised primarily by the translator’s desire to preserve his Hebrew *Vorlage*, which is demonstrated by his regular use of Greek words with Hebrew syntax (Hendel, ‘Text-Critical Value’). According to Hendel the inconsistencies in the Greek are, therefore, the result of literal translations of a different Hebrew *Vorlage* rather than deliberate interpretations. In a similar vein, Aejmelaeus argues that the burden of proof for harmonisations, or deliberate exegetical renderings, must be upheld by substantial evidence that demonstrates why divergences could not have originated with the *Vorlage* (Aejmelaeus, ‘What Can We Know’). From this viewpoint, LXX Genesis is characterised by its strict adherence to its *Vorlage* and any inconsistencies in the Greek should be attributed to a different Hebrew text.

Reflecting on some of the scholarly opinions on the general characteristics of LXX Genesis, we might consider the translation an intelligent and faithful rendering of the Hebrew that veers away from word-for-word literalism. The Greek demonstrates linguistic sensitivity, harmonisation, and possible theologically motivated exegesis, but, where discrepancies exist, there is also the possibility that they were due to a difference in *Vorlage*.

II. Time and Place of Composition

LXX Genesis was probably composed in Alexandria during the third or middle second century B.C.E. This assumption is partly based on the testimony of the *Letter of Aristeas*, but is also substantiated by the dating of papyrus and leather fragments of the Pentateuch from Qumran and Egypt, which are dated to the middle of the second century B.C.E. (4QLXXLev^a [4Q119], 4QLXXNum [4Q121], PRylands Gk. 458). Though the earliest LXX Genesis fragment dates to the first century B.C.E., it is likely that it was among the first books of the Pentateuch to be translated in Egypt.

Qumran evidence for the Hebrew text of Genesis reveals fragments from as early as the middle of the second century B.C.E. The oldest of these is 4QpaleoGen^m (4Q12) and while most of the fragments contain small portions of Genesis, there are only slight deviations from the MT, which means that the Hebrew text was probably stable by the second century. The question remains, however, whether the Hebrew text used by the LXX Genesis translator was an early form of the MT. This obviously has practical implications on how we read the Greek since particular differences between the two texts might have been due to translation decisions or to a different parent text. Nevertheless, the Qumran evidence for Genesis provides the earliest background for the MT and reflects the possible text that was used for the translations of LXX Genesis.

The sheer number and diversity of LXX Genesis texts we have from the ancient world demonstrate its importance. The uncial—or majuscule—manuscripts/fragments are the oldest witnesses to the Greek texts, which were written with uppercase letters. Of these a notable example is the Chester Beatty papyri fragments, which contain a large portion of

most biblical books. Other sources for LXX Genesis can be found in the three most significant codices of the LXX: Vaticanus (B), Sinaiticus (S) and Alexandrinus (A). Codex B is the most complete manuscript, but lacks the first forty-five chapters of Genesis. Codex S contains only fragments of Genesis, while codex A, though slightly later (fifth century C.E.), is the most complete and is probably the best manuscript for LXX Genesis. All of the codices have undergone some type of revision, but they remain the best sources for the Greek text of Genesis that we have today.

The textual and historical evidence point to the fact that LXX Genesis was probably among the first books of the Hebrew Bible to be translated into Greek sometime before the mid-second century B.C.E. According to the witness of *Aristeas*, the Greek text was composed under the reign of Ptolemy II (ca. 280 B.C.E.) as an addition to his massive library. Whether we trust this historical narrative or not, there is good reason to believe that the translation was produced by Greek-speaking Jews in Alexandria sometime around this general period. See further § III.

III. Language

It has been well established that the LXX Pentateuch is representative of standard Koine of the time (cf. Numbers, § III). Connections between the language of the LXX and documentary papyri were noted by Deissmann (*Bible Studies*) in the early days of the publication of papyri, and has been conclusively demonstrated by Lee (*Lexical Study*). Many words can be seen as normal for the Greek of the day, even if not attested before that time, and many can be accounted for as natural derivations from known words in Greek. In the latter cases it is presumed that such words existed but have simply not been preserved in the sources. Both Lee (*Lexical Study*, pp. 139–44) and Evans (*Verbal Syntax*, pp. 263–64) have concluded that the Pentateuch reflects Greek of the early Koine period, and therefore confirming a date for the LXX Pentateuch in the third century B.C.E.

Although the translator of Genesis closely adhered to the Hebrew text, his linguistic skills are demonstrated through his semantic differentiation and his ability to use a variety of Greek terms or expressions depending

on contextual demands. One example is his sensitivity to the various meanings that can be conveyed through the Hebrew נשׂא ‘lift, bear, carry’. In Gen. 4.7 the infinitive of נשׂא is used in the context of Cain’s offering, and the translator chooses προσφέρω ‘offer, bring’ as an appropriate rendering. In Gen. 4.13, however, the infinitive of נשׂא is used again, but it is in the context of Cain not being able to ‘lift, bear’ his punishment. Here the translator renders with ἀφίημι ‘acquit, forgive’ to convey the sense that Cain’s sentence will not be ‘lifted’ or ‘forgiven’. In other instances of נשׂא the translator employs ἐπαίρω ‘lift’, ἀναβλέπω ‘look up’, ἀνίημι ‘spread forth’, θαυμάζω ‘marvel, wonder’, or λαμβάνω ‘take’, which highlights his competence and consideration when taking into account how words are being used in a particular context.

The Greek text of Genesis also contains a significant number of neologisms, most of which are based on existing terms. One example is the word ἀκροβυστία ‘foreskin’, which may have come from the combination of ἀκρο + נשׂא *bšt* ‘shame’ (LEH, p. 23). In this instance it is somewhat surprising that the translator coins a new term since ἀκροποσθία ‘foreskin’ was already in use during that time. When rendering cultic terms like ‘altar’ the translator created the word θυσιαστήριον, which is the combination of either the noun θυσία ‘sacrifice’ or the verb θυσιάζω ‘sacrifice’, and the suffix -τήριον signifying a place (NETS, p. 2). Another neologism from Lamech’s song in Gen. 4.23 demonstrates how the translator might have created a new term based on the construction of the Hebrew. The Hiphil הִאזְנֶה ‘give ear to, listen’ comes from the root זָנָה, which could be the noun ‘ear’ or the verb ‘listen’. In the causative Hiphil stem the term denotes something like ‘make the ear listen’. The translator renders with ἐνωτίσασθε, which seems to be a combination of the prefix ἐν + ὦτα (‘ears’) + the suffix -ίζω. Other examples of neologisms include the addition of the prefix ἀρχι- to indicate the head, or chief, of something, and so we find ἀρχιδεσμώτης ‘head guard’, ἀρχιοινοχός ‘the chief cupbearer’, or ἀρχισιτοποιός ‘the chief baker’.

There are also a number of calques and loan-words in the Greek text of Genesis. Some of these include διαθήκη (= ברית) ‘covenant’, κύριος (= יהוה) ‘Lord’, and στερέωμα (= רקיע) ‘firmament’. Where suitable equivalents could not be found, the translator often rendered a Hebrew

term with the corresponding Greek letters. In Gen. 3.24 the angelic beings that guard the gates to Eden are called *χερουβιμ*, which corresponds to the Hebrew *כרובים* ‘cherubim’.¹ In reference to personal names the translator was sensitive to contextual demands, which is apparent in the case of Eve. In Gen. 3.20 her name is given the explanatory rendering of *חווה* by *Ζωή* ‘life’, but in Gen. 4.1 it is treated as a proper noun (*Ευαν*). In some cases, the translator might also not have known what a particular word in the Hebrew meant. In Gen. 22.13 Abraham finds a ram caught ‘in the thicket’ (*בסבך*), which is rendered with *ἐν φυτῷ σαβεα* ‘in a sabek plant’. This seems to indicate that the translator did not know what type of plant/bush it was.

We noted above that the translator of Genesis paid careful attention to reproducing the Hebrew text accurately and, at times, literally. As a result, the Greek text is littered with Hebraisms, or Hebrew syntactical constructions in the Greek. In Gen. 11.10 we find the Hebrew idiom *בן מאת שנה* (‘son of one hundred years’), which is rendered by *υἱὸς ἑκατὸν ἐτῶν*. In Gen. 13.4 Abraham goes back to the place where he had first made an altar (*שם בראשנה*), which is rendered literally by the awkward *οὗ ἐποίησεν ἐκεῖ τὴν ἀρχήν* (‘where he made it there at the first’). Another Hebrew idiom from Gen. 24.12 is the phrase *ועשה חסד עם אדני* (‘and show steadfast love to my lord’), which is reproduced in the Greek by *καὶ ποιήσον ἔλεος μετὰ τοῦ κυρίου μου* (‘and do mercy with my lord’). In these instances the translator was less concerned with reproducing good Koine, but, rather, felt the need to remain faithful to the Hebrew syntax.

IV. Translation and Composition

A brief overview of Genesis 3 shall highlight some of the translation features of the Greek, which are marked by a close lexical and syntactical relationship to the Hebrew but also include stylistic and, possibly, interpretive changes (Wevers, *Notes Genesis*, pp. 36–50). In 3.1 the MT *ערום*, used to describe the snake, can connote positively ‘prudent, wise’ or negatively ‘cunning’. Though the term is generally translated by

1. Wevers, *Notes Genesis*, p. 50, contends that the concept of angelic guardians was ‘foreign to the Greek’ and thus transliteration was needed.

πανουργεῦω ‘crafty, wise’ elsewhere in the LXX, the translator renders with φρονιμώτατος ‘thoughtful, wise’, which depicts the serpent in a more positive light. Following this, the MT describes the snake as being wise over ‘all the beasts of the field’ (מכל חית השדה), which the Greek expands considerably to over ‘all the wild animals that were upon the earth’ (πάντων τῶν θηρίων τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς). The phrase is similarly translated in 3.14, but the more consistent rendering of שדה ‘field’ is ἀγρός ‘field’. Was the translator trying to emphasise the prominence of the snake in its pre-cursed state, which might reflect other ancient Near Eastern beliefs regarding the divine or semi-divine qualities of serpents? Or was the word choice based on the translator’s best lexical options? Whatever the reason, the translator then seems to highlight the serpent’s wisdom in its dialogue with Eve. Rather than asking the slightly more equivocal ‘Did God actually say’, we read a more direct question that challenges God’s motives: ‘Why is it that God said...?’ (Τί ὅτι εἶπεν ὁ θεός...; Gen. 3.1). Whether these translational decisions were intentional interpretations or not remains open to question, but we see that the slight variations in the Greek could have portrayed the serpent in a more positive light.

As the narrative continues other word choices and additions reflect minor variations from the Hebrew text. In Gen. 3.9 God calls out to ‘the man’ (האדם), but the Greek translates with the proper noun ‘Adam’. When God confronts Adam in 3.11 he asks two separate questions in the MT (‘Who told you that you were naked? Have you eaten of the tree?’) but the translator adds εἰ μὴ (‘unless’), which produces a single question (‘Who told you that you are naked, unless you have eaten from the tree?’). This clarifies the cause and effect between eating the fruit and comprehending one’s nakedness (*Bd’A* 1, p. 109). At the end of God’s question we find the further addition of τούτου μόνου (‘this one alone’) referring to the tree that God had told them not to eat from, which emphasises the unequivocal nature of the command.

The result of Eve’s disobedience in the MT is that her pain will increase during her pregnancy and in childbirth (3.16). The Greek, however, translates MT הרנך (‘your pregnancy’) by τὸν στεναγμὸν σου (‘your groaning, sighing’), which seems to highlight the anguish or

mental suffering that Eve will experience alongside her physical pain. The second half of v. 16 contains the enigmatic use of תשובה ('your desire'), which only occurs three times in the MT (Gen. 3.16; 4.7; Cant. 7.11). The translator renders with the noun ἡ ἀποστροφή ('return, turning back') and repeats this in Gen. 4.7, where Abel's 'turning' is to Cain. In each case ἡ ἀποστροφή probably conveys a sense of returning to a right relationship. Bergmeier argues that the translator attempted to explain the problematic term (תשובה) in the light of the previous narrative (Gen. 2.21-25), while also reflecting the Hellenistic mythical desire for original unity (Bergmeier, 'Zur Septuagintaübersetzung'). Eve's return to Adam would, therefore, signify her desire to be reunited as one flesh with her husband after being estranged from him because of their disobedience.² Thus it is unlikely, as Brayford contends, that the LXX Genesis translation of Gen. 3.16 'represents a similarly motivated attempt to control women's sexuality' (*Genesis*, pp. 243–44). Instead, it is more probable that the translator viewed the 'return' of Eve to Adam as her longing to restore a harmonious relationship (Scarлата, *Outside of Eden*, pp. 87–91).

In the final scene of expulsion from Eden we find other subtle distinctions from the MT. Previously the translator had transliterated עדן ('Eden') as Εδεν—or had rendered with παράδεισος—but twice in 3.23–24 he employs τοῦ παραδείσου τῆς τρυφῆς ('the garden of delight'). The variance may have been stylistic, but it also seems to emphasise the luxury once experienced in Eden in contrast to the pain and suffering Adam will face when cast out of the garden. We have already mentioned the transliteration of 'cherubim' in 3.24, but to make clear the role of these angelic beings the translator includes the addition that they were 'stationed' (ἔταξεν) by God, along with the flaming sword, to guard the way to the tree of life.

The changes of the Greek from the presumed Hebrew *Vorlage* do not alter the content of the narrative dramatically, but they do provide a nuanced version of the story that offers a slightly different portrayal of the serpent and the consequences of the first human beings' disobedience to God's commandment.

2. *Jub.* 3.24 follows the LXX and seems to convey a similar meaning. 'Your place of return (refuge) will be with your husband and he shall rule over you'.

V. Key Text-Critical Issues

Having examined some of the translational features by focusing on one chapter of Genesis, we shall now consider other text-critical issues from various passages that demonstrate the techniques used by the translator to best represent his *Vorlage* in the Greek.

In Gen. 2.2 God completes his work of creation and we read in the MT: ויכל אלהים ביום השביעי ('And on the seventh day God finished'). The Greek, however, translates και συνετέλεσεν ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἕκτῃ ('And on the sixth day God finished...'). The reason for this significant alteration to the creation narrative has been much debated, but there are two likely possibilities for the translation. The first is that the translator harmonised his presumed Hebrew *Vorlage* because the text seemed to imply that God worked on the seventh day. Since it would be contradictory to state that God worked on the Sabbath day that he created for rest, the translator 'corrects' the Hebrew and has God cease from activity on the sixth day. The second possibility is that the Hebrew *Vorlage* used by the translator contained הששי 'sixth'. Tov argues that it is impossible to tell whether the easier reading of 'sixth' was based on הששי in the Hebrew text or whether an independent exegetical tradition developed in the LXX, which is also found in the Samaritan Pentateuch and the Peshitta (Tov, *Text-Critical*, p. 128). Hendel, however, contends that, since the predominant characteristic of LXX Genesis is to conserve its presumed *Vorlage*, it is likely הששי was present in the Hebrew text (Hendel, *Text*, p. 33). From a text-critical perspective the *lectio difficilior* of 'seventh' might be the preferred reading, but, since it makes little sense that God worked on the Sabbath, there are still issues regarding what the Hebrew *Vorlage* possibly contained.

In Gen. 4.7-8 there are various lexical and syntactical difficulties in the Hebrew. In v. 7a the phrase הלוא אִם-תִּיטִיב שאת ואם לא תִּיטִיב לפתח (‘Is it not that if you do well there is forgiveness/uplifting? But if you do not do well, sin is lying at the door...’) is ambiguous since שאת תִּיטִיב could refer to Cain’s offering being accepted or to his forgiveness—or possibly to both. We also note the grammatical problem of the masculine רבץ ‘lie, couch’ that appears to refer to the feminine חטאת ‘sin’. In this case it is unclear whether רבץ should be understood as a masculine participle, an imperative, or as a possible loan-word from

Akkadian denoting some type of doorstep demon (*CAD* XIV, pp. 10–13). The translator understood God’s response to Cain in the context of a cultic sacrifice and so renders with οὐκ, ἐὰν ὀρθῶς προσενέγκῃς, ὀρθῶς δὲ μὴ διέλῃς, ἤμαρτες; ἡσύχασον (‘Is it not that if you rightly offer, but do not rightly divide you sin? Be quiet!’). The rendering of שׂאֵב טִיבֵיב with ὀρθῶς προσενέγκῃς likely reflects the concept of offering an appropriate sacrifice to God, which must be rightly divided. It appears that the translator mistook לַפְתַּח for לַנְחַת ‘to cut’, which would be plausible considering the context. The difficulty is that when διαίρέω is used in a cultic context it always refers to the cutting or dividing of meat (e.g., Gen. 15.10; Lev. 1.12, 17; 5.8), and we recall that Cain offered from ‘the fruits of the earth’. It is possible that the translator may have manipulated the Hebrew consonants, but it might also be the case that this was his best ‘contextual guess’ (Tov, ‘Did the Septuagint’, pp. 56–61). Since Cain has not rightly divided his offering, he sins (ἤμαρτες), which understands חָטָא as a second masculine singular verb rather than a noun. The translator’s use of the imperative ἡσύχασον (‘be quiet!’) seems odd unless קַבֵּץ is taken as an imperative meaning ‘lie down’, or ‘calm down’. Rather than the threat of ‘sin lying at the door’ in the MT, the Greek conveys a very different response from God that focuses on the sin that Cain has committed through his inappropriately divided sacrifice.

In 4.8 the translator faced another challenge in how best to represent a lacunae in the text. The MT reads וַיֹּאמֶר קַיִן אֶל הָאֵבֶל אָחִיו וַיְהִי בֵּהֵיוֹתָם בַּשָּׂדֶה (‘And Cain said to Abel his brother... And when they were in the field...’). Throughout the MT וַיֹּאמֶר is almost universally used to indicate direct speech and we would expect some dialogue between the two brothers. It is probable that the MT of Gen. 4.8 had been corrupted or somehow altered in the course of transmission (on a possible scribal error, see Hendel, *Text*, pp. 46–77), and so the translator closely follows his presumed *Vorlage* until he fills in the gap with his own interpretation of what Cain said: καὶ εἶπεν Καὶν πρὸς Ἀβελ τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ Διέλθωμεν εἰς τὸ πεδίον. καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ εἶναι αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ (‘And Cain said to his brother Abel, “Let us pass through into the plain”. And it was when they were in the plain...’). The addition of διέλθωμεν εἰς τὸ πεδίον could reflect a different Hebrew *Vorlage* that possibly contained נֵלְכָה הַשָּׂדֶה (‘let us go to the field’), as in the Samaritan Pentateuch. If this was the case we might have expected the Greek to read, πορευθῶμεν

εἰς τὸ πεδῖον ('let us go into the plain'), since the first common plural cohortative of ἵη is almost always rendered by πορεύω (Gen. 33.12; 37.17; 43.8; Exod. 5.3, 8, 17; Deut. 13.3, 14). The uncommon phrase διέλθωμεν εἰς τὸ πεδῖον suggests that the translator wanted to fill in what appeared to be lacking in the text to provide a clearer transition to the subsequent murder of Abel in the field (Scarлата, *Outside of Eden*, pp. 113–15).

Another text-critical issue that many scholars have found perplexing is the translator's treatment of the divine names. Since a common feature of LXX Genesis is its close lexical and syntactical representation of its presumed Hebrew *Vorlage*, we might expect more systematic renderings of אלהים and יהוה (or יהוה אלהים). Instead, LXX Genesis varies between its use of θεός, κύριος and κύριος ὁ θεός with no apparent rationale behind its translation. Some scholars have concluded that the variants are likely inner-Greek corruptions that have taken place over time and, as a result, it is impossible to compare the Greek and Hebrew in its use of the divine names (*Bd'A* 1, p. 50). Rösel, however, contends that the variation of divine names in LXX Genesis represent the translator's desire to express particular attributes of God in different contexts. When speaking about the creator God who is the sovereign king, the translator uses θεός, but the preferred name for Lord over the chosen people is κύριος, and κύριος ὁ θεός for the creator of all humanity (Rösel, *Übersetzung*, pp. 251–52). Wevers seems to agree with the notion that the translator implemented some sort of theology in his use of the divine names, as his comments suggest (*Notes Genesis*, pp. 51, 60, 79). While there may have been some exegetical revisions by the translator, LXX Genesis is, at best, inconsistent in its rendering of the divine names and little can be definitively said about this aspect of the translation.

One final text-critical issue is the systematic differences in the translations of chronology in Genesis 5 and 11. In the genealogy of Genesis 5 we discover that the time from creation to the flood is 1,656 years in the MT, but 2,242 years in the Greek. In Gen. 5.3 Adam was 130 years old when he fathered Seth, but was 230 years old in LXX Genesis. The MT states that he lived another 800 years whereas LXX Genesis says that Adam lived for 700 more years. Hendel points out the consistent pattern of LXX Genesis to add 100 years to the fathering age and to subtract 100 years from their following life span (*Text*, pp. 64–65). The

most significant difference, however, was the number of years Methuselah lived in LXX Genesis (969 years), which places the end of his life fourteen years after the flood. This discrepancy with the account of Noah did not go unnoticed in the early church and raised questions about the accuracy of LXX Genesis versus the MT. In the postdiluvian chronology in Genesis 11 we find similar disparities, but scholars have disagreed on whether these changes were systematic harmonisations or if they were based on a different Hebrew *Vorlage* (Hendel, *Text*, pp. 61–80). However the changes came about, they demonstrate that the Greek translator either produced an accurate rendering of a Genesis recension that differed from the MT, or he attempted to harmonise the text for exegetical purposes.

6. Ideology and Exegesis

A discussion of the ideology or theological motivations of the LXX Genesis translator is made more complex by the fact that we do not know precisely what *Vorlage* was being used and how closely it resembled the MT. Grammatical and lexical choices may have been based on a Hebrew text that we no longer possess. Despite these difficulties, however, we can make some tentative judgements about the translator's possible influences and whether these had an effect on the Greek.

It was pointed out (§ I) that there are several different theories regarding who the Greek translators were and what techniques they used, but from the analysis above it is apparent that one cannot pigeonhole the Genesis translator into any particular classification. LXX Genesis does not fall into a 'literal' or 'free' translation category—those terms being anachronistic—and does not seem to follow a guiding model or philosophy (Brock, 'Aspects'; Barr, *Typology*). The Greek remains close to the Hebrew throughout and includes Hebraisms where the translator thought it necessary to preserve the original text. In other instances, however, the translation harmonises, adds, or removes for the sake of a smoother, more comprehensible rendering in the Greek. Whether there was a specific ideology or strategy behind the rendering of Genesis cannot be known, but it is clear that the LXX Genesis translator rendered the Hebrew with great care and, in most instances, with minimal interpretation.

Contemporary scholarly debate on the LXX tends to focus on either linguistic analysis, statistical analysis of corresponding lexemes in the Greek and Hebrew, or the possible exegetical tendencies demonstrated in the translation. Some claim that theological or exegetical renderings are virtually impossible to determine since we know very little about who the translators were and what motivations they had in translating Hebrew scriptures into Greek (Aejmelaeus, ‘Translation Technique’, pp. 25–28). Aejmelaeus contends that, without the background of the translators themselves, we should pay close attention to linguistic analysis, which takes into consideration deviations from literality and offers insights into the ‘free renderings’ we find in the text (Aejmelaeus, ‘The Significance’). In LXX Genesis there are consistent patterns of translation that are useful in determining the translator’s preferred renderings, but the text does contain some fluidity where the translator was probably working by intuition rather than according to a specific technique. Linguistic analysis can offer helpful explanations but, despite our lack of information on the translators themselves, it is still possible to discern potential social or religious influences that might have had an effect on the Greek rendering.³

7. Reception History

The Greek text of Genesis was used by Jewish interpreters such as Philo and Josephus and was influential in the text of the New Testament. There are various direct quotations from Genesis in the New Testament and most of them follow LXX Genesis with some slight variations. In Mt. 19.4-5 and Mk 10.6-8 Jesus is questioned about the legality of divorce and, in response, he appeals to the original order of creation in Gen. 1.27 and 2.24. In both instances the LXX version is used, but in Mark’s Gospel the preface ἀπὸ δὲ ἀρχῆς κτίσεως (‘But from the beginning of creation’) is added. The Pauline epistles also contain passages from LXX Genesis, such as Romans 4 where the author uses Abraham as an example of faithfulness. Paul cites the Greek of Gen. 15.6 and 17.4-5 to make the

3. For one example, see Scarlata, *Outside of Eden*, pp. 207–12, where I argue for the possible influence of Aristotle’s *Poetics* and the form of Greek tragic literature in LXX Gen. 4.1-16.

argument that Abraham is the father of both Jew and Gentile and that his righteousness by faith should be emulated by believers in Christ. There are also allusions to words and expressions that are found in LXX Genesis. The Gospel of John begins with the phrase Ἐν ἀρχῇ ('in the beginning'), which is a clear reference to Gen. 1.1. Similar allusions to Christ as the ἀρχή of creation can be found in Colossians 1–2 (Dines, 'Light', pp. 18–19). It is apparent that the New Testament authors adopted the Greek text of Genesis and, in many instances, their writings reflect the lexical choices and syntax of LXX Genesis.

Beyond the New Testament LXX Genesis was the preferred text of the early Church Fathers since most of them did not read Hebrew. Some of the translations in LXX Genesis were later amended by the works of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion, which were collected in Origin's *Hexapla*. LXX Genesis was likely used as the parent text for the Old Latin translations of Genesis (*Vetus Latina*), which were subsequently updated by Jerome in his goal of producing a Latin Bible (the Vulgate) in accordance with the *hebraica veritas*. LXX Genesis, however, remained the text of choice in Greek-speaking Christian traditions.

Bibliography

- Aejmelaeus, A., 'The Significance of Clause Connectors in the Syntactical and Translation-Technical Study of the Septuagint', in C.E. Cox (ed.), *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1987), pp. 361–80.
- 'Translation Technique and the Intention of the Translator', in C.E. Cox (ed.), *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991), pp. 23–36.
- 'What Can We Know about the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Septuagint?', *ZAW* 99 (1987), pp. 58–89.
- Barr, J., *The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979).
- Bergmeier, R., 'Zur Septuagintaübersetzung von Gen. 3:16', *ZAW* 79 (1967), pp. 77–79.
- Brayford, S., *Genesis* (Septuagint Commentary Series; Leiden: Brill, 2007).
- Brock, S., 'Aspects of Translation Technique in Antiquity', *GRBS* 20 (1979), pp. 67–87.

- Brown, W.P., *Structure, Role, and Ideology in the Hebrew and Greek Texts of Genesis 1:1–2:3* (ed. D.L. Peterson; SBLDS; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993).
- Cook, J., ‘Exegesis in the Septuagint’, *JNSL* 30 (2004), pp. 1–19.
- ‘The Exegesis of the Greek Genesis’, in C.E. Cox (ed.), *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1987), pp. 91–125.
- ‘Genesis 1 in the Septuagint as Example of the Problem: Text and Tradition’, *JNSL* 10 (1982), pp. 25–36.
- ‘Greek Philosophy and the Septuagint’, *JNSL* 24 (1998), pp. 177–91.
- ‘The Septuagint of Genesis: Text and/or Interpretation?’, in A. Wénin (ed.), *Studies in the Book of Genesis* (Sterling, VA: University Press, 2001), pp. 315–29.
- Deissmann, G.A., *Bible Studies: Contributions, Chiefly from Papyri and Inscriptions, to the History of the Language, the Literature, and the Religion of Hellenistic Judaism and Primitive Christianity* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1909).
- Dines, J., ‘Imaging Creation: The Septuagint Translation of Genesis 1:2’, *HeyJ* 36 (1995), pp. 439–50.
- ‘Light from the Septuagint on the New Testament—or Vice Versa?’, in J. Joosten and P.J. Tomson (eds.), *Voces Biblicae: Septuagint Greek and its Significance for the New Testament* (Leuven: Peeters, 2007), pp. 17–34.
- Evans, T.V., *Verbal Syntax in the Greek Pentateuch: Natural Greek Usage and Hebrew Interference* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).
- Harl, M., ‘La Bible d’Alexandrie. I. The Translation Principles’, in B.A. Taylor (ed.), *X Congress Volume of the IOSCS, 1998* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001), pp. 181–98.
- Harl, M. (ed.), *La Bible d’Alexandrie. Vol. I, La Genèse* (Paris: Cerf, 1986).
- Hendel, R.S., ‘On the Text-Critical Value of Septuagint Genesis: A Reply to Rösel’, *BIOSCS* 32 (1999), pp. 31–34.
- The Text of Genesis 1–11: Textual Studies and Critical Edition* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998).
- Hiebert, R., ‘Lexicography and the Translation of a Translation: The NETS Version and the Septuagint of Genesis’, *BIOSCS* 37 (2004), pp. 73–86.
- ‘Translating a Translation: The Septuagint of Genesis and the NETS Project’, in B. Taylor (ed.), *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001), pp. 263–84.
- ‘Translation Technique in LXX Genesis and Its Implications for the NETS Version’, *BIOSCS* 33 (2000), pp. 76–93.
- Larsson, G., ‘The Chronology of the Pentateuch—A Comparison of MT and LXX’, *JBL* 102 (1983), pp. 401–409.
- Lee, J.A.L., *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch* (SBLSCS 14; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983).

The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint

- Rösel, M., 'The Text-Critical Value of Septuagint-Genesis', *BIOSCS* 31 (1998), pp. 62–70.
- Übersetzung als Vollendung der Auslegung: Studien zur Genesis-Septuaginta* (BZAW 223; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1994).
- Scarlata, M.W., *Outside of Eden: Cain in the Ancient Versions of Genesis 4:1-16* (LHBOTS 573; London: T&T Clark International, 2012).
- Sollamo, R., 'Repetitions of Possessive Pronouns in the Greek Pentateuch', *BIOSCS* 14 (1981), pp. 41–42.
- Tov, E., 'Did the Septuagint Translators Always Understand their Hebrew Text?', in A. Pietersma and C.E. Cox (eds.), *De Septuaginta* (Festschrift J.W. Wevers; Mississauga, ON: Benben, 1984), pp. 53–70.
- The Text-critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (Jerusalem: Simor, 1981).
- Wevers, J.W., 'The Interpretive Character and Significance of the LXX', in M. Sæbø (ed.), *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), vol. I, pp. 84–107.
- Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993).
- Text History of the Greek Genesis* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974).
- Wevers, J.W. (ed.), *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum*. Vol. I, *Genesis* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974).
- Zipor, M., *The Septuagint Translation to the Book of Genesis* (Hebrew) (Ramat-Gan: Universitat Bar-Ilan, 2006).

Exodus

Alison Salvesen

Editions

(a) Standard Greek Editions

Göttingen, vol. II.1, *Exodus* (Wevers and Quast, 1991).

Cambridge, vol. I.2, *Exodus and Leviticus* (Brooke and McLean, 1909).

Rahlfs-Hanhart, vol. I, pp. 86–157.

Swete, vol. I, pp. 104–87.

(b) Modern Translations

NETS (Perkins, 2007), pp. 43–81.

LXX.D (Roloff and Weber, 2009), pp. 56–97.

Bd'A 2 (Le Boulluec and Sandevour, 1989).

La Biblia Griega, vol. I (Fernández Marcos *et al.*, 2008), pp. 141–226.

Hebrew (Zipor, 2006).

I. General Characteristics

The book's Greek title, *ἔξοδος* (meaning a 'going out' or 'expedition'), differs from that found in the Hebrew Bible: like the other books of Torah, its Hebrew name, *Shemoth*, is based on its opening words, in this case ואלה שמות ('these are the names of...'). The Greek title 'Exodus' refers to the departure from Egypt, one of the main themes (though not the sole one) of the book. The word as such appears in Exodus only at 19.1 in this sense, but outside Exodus it occurs in Num. 33.38; Pss. 104(105).38; 113(114).1; 3 Kgdms 6.1, and in Josephus' *Antiquities* 5.72. It became the superscription of the book in MSS Vaticanus, Coislinianus, and, with the addition 'from Egypt', in Codex Alexandrinus. Other authors, especially Philo, used the term *ἐξαγωγή* 'Exagoge'

(a ‘leading out’), which may have more positive connotations, and arises from the verb ἐξάγω, which is commonly used in the book (*Bd’A* 2, p. 26). Lee (*Lexical Study*, p. 67) notes that it is used in the papyri of release from prison, which would be appropriate for the story of the Israelites’ departure from Egypt.

The Greek text provides a faithful translation of the Hebrew that is less literal than that of Numbers and Deuteronomy, but closer than LXX Genesis. It is characterised by Perkins (NETS, pp. 43–51) as a generally faithful representation of a Hebrew text similar to MT, but with some longer, shorter or differently ordered material, employing a degree of lexical variation rather than consistently using standardising or stereotyping renderings. Aejmelaeus comments that the translator of Exodus ‘was the one who of all the Pentateuchal translators paid most attention to the requirements of the Greek language’ (‘What Can We Know’, p. 94), pointing to his ‘numerous excellent free renderings’. The one poem of the book, the Song of the Sea (Exod. 15.1-18) is rendered in literary prose, and poetry on the Greek model is not attempted (Gera, ‘Translating’). The analysis of Wevers (*Text Hist. Exodus*, p. 40) concludes that the text of Exodus in Codex Vaticanus shows hardly any revision towards MT, whereas Alexandrinus has strong traces of Hebraising revision that had taken place before Origen established his ‘corrected’ text of LXX.

The main distinctive feature of LXX Exodus is the difference between MT and the oldest known form of the Greek text in terms of order and material, in MT chs. 36–40, known as the Second Tabernacle Account. Tables outlining these differences can be found in *Bd’A* 2 (p. 69) and Aejmelaeus (‘Septuagintal’, p. 119). The disparity between Origen’s text corresponding to MT 36.8–39.43 and that of Vaticanus meant that the editors of the Larger Cambridge edition placed the Origenic text in a separate appendix (Brooke and McLean, *Octateuch*, pp. 295–304).

II. Time and Place of Composition

According to the *Letter of Aristeas*, Exodus as part of the Pentateuch was translated in the reign of Ptolemy II Philadelphus (281–246 B.C.E.), in Alexandria in Egypt. Since the translation style of each book of the

Pentateuch differs, it is likely that each was rendered separately by different translators. Towards the end of the third century B.C.E. Demetrius the Chronographer paraphrases Exod. 15.22-27 using vocabulary of the Greek version, and cites Exod. 13.18 in a LXX version (*Bd'A 2*, p. 29; Holladay, *Fragments*, pp. 75–77).

Internal evidence may support an Alexandrian provenance for LXX Exodus. The word θῖβις, used in Exod. 2.3 to render תבה, means 'basket' in the papyri and may be an Egyptian loan-word (Lee, *Lexical Study*, p. 115). Bogaert ('L'orientation') notes that the compass points given in the first Tabernacle account for the court (Exod. 27.9-15) must reflect an Alexandrian orientation since נגב תימנה is rendered as πρὸς λίβα 'West', צפון as πρὸς ἀπηνλιώτην 'East', ים as κατὰ θάλασσαν 'North', קדמה מזרחה as πρὸς νότον as 'South'. However, in the second Tabernacle account (37.7-11: also the Tabernacle itself in 26.18-22) the directions are rendered according to a Palestinian viewpoint (though this may imply merely that the translator adjusted his geography here—see Fraenkel, 'Übersetzungsnorm').

III. Language

As with the other books of the Pentateuch, the language is koine Greek and the vocabulary is in harmony with the lexicon and vernacular usage of Greek in Alexandria, as attested by Egyptian papyri of the third and second centuries B.C.E. (Lee, *Lexical Study*, p. 145). However, the words for Passover and Sabbath are Greek transcriptions of the Aramaic forms *pascha* and *sabbata* (*Bd'A 2*, pp. 48–49, 57–58).

Le Boulluec and Sandevour (*Bd'A 2*, pp. 32–46) provide an overview of the lexical choices for themes such as oppression, commands and plagues, which also influenced later LXX translations, Jewish Greek compositions, and the New Testament. Two of the less obvious choices are 'Red Sea', ἐρυθρὰ θάλασσα for ים סוף, the Sea of Reeds, and 'Tent of Witness', σκηνή τοῦ μαρτυρίου for אהל המועד, Tent of Meeting, deriving the second noun from the root עוּד 'witness' instead of the similar one עָד 'to appoint a time'.

IV. Translation and Composition

Aejmelaeus ('What Can We Know', pp. 111–12) concludes that the extensive pluses of the LXX are due to the Hebrew *Vorlage* of LXX, since the translator's freedom in rendering does not necessarily imply that he would add material, and in some cases the pluses are attested in other texts such as Qumran fragments or the Samaritan Pentateuch. However, Wevers believes that the translator was responsible for expansions, out of a desire to clarify the text and to harmonise it with Deuteronomy (*Text Hist. Exodus*, pp. 147–48).

With regard to translation technique, Aejmelaeus ('What Can We Know', pp. 95–99) provides a summary of syntactical elements in Exodus. $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ appears 16% of the time to render \imath , whereas Genesis uses it 25%. This is against normal Greek usage where $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ is more common than $\kappa\alpha\iota$. $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu$ occurs 28 times (and not just for \imath) against 41 in Genesis. In contrast, $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ occurs 85% of the time to render \imath in causal clauses, instead of $\delta\tau\iota$, compared with 55% in Genesis. Aejmelaeus cites the work of Soisalon–Soininen, who observed that the Exodus translator rendered infinitive constructions in a way sensitive to normal Greek usage, including the genitive absolute and circumstantial participle (Exod. 5.20; 14.11). The translator also uses participles from time to time to render the first finite verb of coordinate clauses, though not as often as Genesis, Job and Esther. Sollamo's study, also cited by Aejmelaeus, demonstrates relative freedom in rendering Hebrew semi-prepositions, such as לפני , על פי and ביד . There are also 30 cases of pre-positive possessive pronouns out of 350, an unusually high proportion for LXX, and reflecting a relatively free approach to word order (Aejmelaeus, 'What Can We Know', p. 95, following Wifstrand).

A certain amount of smoothing and harmonisation on the translational level has been noted. For instance, in the account of the theophany at Sinai, the Greek clarifies when it will be safe for the people to touch the mountain (Exod. 19.13). Elsewhere the translation says that Moses stretched out his staff towards the heavens rather than over the whole land of Egypt (10.13), and explains חמשים 'prepared for battle' (13.18) to mean 'in the fifth generation' (πέμπτη δὲ γενεᾷ) on the basis of 6.16–20 (Wevers, 'How the Greek'). The translator also resolves contradictions in

the Hebrew of Exodus 33 regarding what Moses was to see: God's way, his face, his glory or his goodness. The LXX explains in vv.13-14 that Moses wishes to see God himself and his glory in vv. 18-19 (Sommer, 'Translation as Commentary').

V. Key Text-Critical Issues

As mentioned above, a key issue in LXX Exodus is the order and contents of the second Tabernacle account, MT chs. 35–40. Writing to Julius Africanus in the mid-third century C.E., the Christian scholar Origen comments despairingly over the different versions he found in the various manuscripts, 'there is so much variation concerning the Tabernacle and its court, the ark, the garments of the high priest and the priests, that even the meaning does not seem to be similar' (*Ep. Afr.* §5[3]; §7). The oldest extant Greek manuscripts, in particular the fourth-century Codex Vaticanus, give a shorter version of the account of the making of the Tabernacle. They have material covering MT chs. 35–40 in a different order and in a shorter form. A lengthy marginal note in two MSS at LXX 36.8 that may be from Origen himself or another early scholar calls attention to the following chapters. It observes how the Greek of Origen's revised LXX text, with its asterisked additions to correspond to the Hebrew, barely matches the text of non-Hexaplaric LXX manuscripts. In his synopsis of biblical versions, the Hexapla, Origen tried to correct the discrepancy using his basic knowledge of Hebrew and the later Jewish Greek translators, especially Theodotion, who would have revised the Greek of Exodus to match the current Hebrew text (O'Connell, *Theodotianic Revision*, p. 292; Wevers, 'PreOrigen', p. 125; *Text Hist. Exodus*, p. 13; but see also Fraenkel, 'Die Quellen').

What is the significance of the profound difference between the Old Greek and MT in these chapters? W. Robertson Smith summarised the positions over a century ago: he noted that the LXX evidence means either 'that text of this section [the Tabernacle account] of the Pentateuch was not yet fixed in the third century before Christ, or that the translator did not feel himself bound to treat it with the same reverence as the rest of the Law' (*The Old Testament*, pp. 124–25).

The first explanation, that at the time of translation the end of the Hebrew book of Exodus existed in one short version or two versions of differing length, has further possible permutations. Either the final redaction of Hebrew Exodus in the long form presented by MT was a later development, or a long Hebrew version circulated in Palestine along with short Hebrew and Greek versions in Egypt, or both versions were available in both places. Overall, the implications of a variant early Hebrew *Vorlage* differing from MT would enhance the importance of the Old Greek Exodus for Hebrew text criticism: recovering the oldest form of the Greek text would be particularly desirable, as it would reflect an important early or alternative stage in the development of the book of Exodus.

The second hypothesis, that the translator or a later editor produced a shorter Greek version from his longer Hebrew *Vorlage*, raises questions over the reception of the Pentateuch in the Diaspora. It suggests that Jews in Alexandria regarded the text of a book of the Torah as sufficiently important to translate, but that it was also acceptable to abridge repetitious material and reorder the final chapters. If the different text in Old Greek Exodus is due to an editor or reviser, recovering the earliest stage of the Greek would not be of any interest to scholars of the Hebrew text as it would represent a local and aberrant text of no relevance for the history of the Hebrew Exodus.

There have been several important studies of the phenomenon (for summaries, see Wade, *Consistency*, pp. 4–9; Bogaert, ‘L’importance’, pp. 400–403). Various more nuanced positions have emerged between the two main hypotheses. For instance, the first Tabernacle account may have been translated first, while a later translator rendered the second account on the basis of the first, without revising the latter. This would help solve the problem of inconsistency in terms and in arrangement between the accounts (Wevers, *Text Hist. Exodus*, pp. 143–46; Wade, *Consistency*, pp. 243–45).

Evidence from Qumran would tend not to support the idea that only a single short Hebrew form was available in the mid-third century B.C.E. 4QExod-Levf, a very early Hebrew text (from mid-third century B.C.E.), has some affinities with both MT and LXX, but more with the Samaritan Pentateuch, especially in that it tends to expand the text. Most importantly, it covers chs. 39–40, and shows that at this early date there already

existed a Hebrew text which had the order of MT (chs. 39–40–Lev 1), against the LXX order where the material in MT 39.1–31 appears in LXX ch. 36. 4QpaleoExod^m (dating from 100–25 B.C.E.) is less important because it does not cover the whole of the second Tabernacle account (only 36.25–37.16), but it does have a Samaritan-type expansive text (Lemmelijn, ‘So-Called’). On the other hand, a fifth-century manuscript of the Old Latin version of Exodus, Monacensis, arguably presents the oldest witness to the original LXX, preceding the form represented by Vaticanus. It appears to omit chs. 25–31, and chs. 36–40 are at variance in some details from both Vaticanus and MT (Bogaert, ‘L’importance’).

Supporting the basic priority of MT, Wevers, Wade, and Aejmelaeus stress that a translator’s faithfulness to his text is not measured by his consistency in translating certain words and syntactical constructions. All three emphasise that the translators of Exodus tried to make sense of their *Vorlage* and to convey that sense to their readers: what appear to be inconsistencies in rendering terms are often adaptations to particular contexts of the construction of the Tabernacle. Reordering may appear drastic, but it may come about because a translator or editor wanted to bring out the significance of certain aspects of the Tabernacle, such as the high priests’ vestments. Even shortening the text may have the purpose of sharpening the focus on the essentials, and is not necessarily the result of boredom or carelessness. Aejmelaeus, however, points out that there is no reason why the Old Greek version of the second Tabernacle account could not reflect both a shorter, different Hebrew *Vorlage* and also some creativity on the part of the translator (‘Septuagintal’, p. 130).

The foregoing is only a summary of the main points in the discussion, and it should be clear that the problem of the Tabernacle accounts does not admit of an easy solution.

VI. Ideology and Exegesis

The translator was both faithful to his Hebrew text and also tried to make sense of it, introducing harmonisations within the book (Wevers, ‘How the Greek’; Gooding, *Account*). Sometimes such an approach shades into more theological or exegetical renderings. For example, the phrase יהוה איש מלחמה ‘The Lord is a man of war’ as κύριος συντηρίβων πολέμους ‘the

Lord, shattering wars' in Exod. 15.3 is not so much an anti-anthropomorphism as a statement that God is always victorious. It thus ties in with what is said in chs. 14 and 17 about God fighting for the Israelites, and is in turn picked up in Isa. 42.13 (Perkins, 'The Lord is a Warrior').

Van der Horst ('Gij zult') argues that in Exod. 22.27(28) the rather surprising translation 'you shall not revile the gods', using the plural *θεοί* for אלהים, was intended to show potentially hostile outsiders that the Jewish Law forbade insulting gods worshipped locally.

In Exod. 12.48-49, *גר* is rendered as *προσήλυτος*, the first example of the use of the term in LXX, *πάροικος* being used for *גר* in places where it has a non-religious connotation (Exod. 18.3). Although Le Boulluec and Sandevour (*Bd'A*, pp. 51–52) argue that *προσήλυτος* in Exodus 12 refers to a Jewish immigrant joining the local community for Passover, this seems unlikely, given the requirement in v. 48 to circumcise such a person, and Büchner ('Relationship') believes that the reference is to a convert to Judaism.

There are also intriguing points of contact with the halakhic exegesis of the Mekhilta (probably third century C.E.) (Büchner, 'Relationship' and 'Jewish Commentaries'). Gooding ('Examples') has also noticed that LXX's interpretation of 27.14-16, regarding the unusual height of the hangings and the gate screen of the Tabernacle, tallies with that of the Babylonian Talmud (*b. 'Erub.* 2b).

The Hebrew of Exod. 24.10 states that the Israelite elders saw the God of Israel and ate and drank, but given that Moses himself only saw God's back in ch. 33, LXX renders as 'they saw *the place where* the God of Israel stood'. The revision of Symmachus, dated to the end of the second century C.E., goes further and states, 'they saw *in a vision* the God of Israel'. Interpretative elements are a prominent feature of what survives of Symmachus. For instance, he renders 6.12, 30 as 'I am not pure in speech' (MT 'I am uncircumcised of lip'; LXX 'I am inarticulate', 'weak-voiced') (Salvesen, *Symmachus*, pp. 63–111).

VII. Reception History

Themes from Exodus suffuse the narrative of the *Letter of Aristeas*, demonstrating that the unknown Jewish author had internalised and reflected on the narrative to the extent that he could produce an

elaborately allusive re-formation of the story without subverting his ostensible identity as a cultured non-Jewish Greek courtier (Orlinsky, 'The Septuagint'; Hacham, 'Aristeas'; Honigman, 'Narrative Function'). It is likely that the work's detailed account of Ptolemy's gifts to the high priest Eleazar and the Temple is linked to the Greek account of the Tabernacle.

It is doubtful that knowledge of elements of the exodus story in some non-Jewish authors derived from the LXX version, particularly since some of their writings date to a period before it was rendered into Greek (Gruen, *Heritage*, pp. 41–72). Jewish writers who countered such accounts, however, employ the LXX version, denouncing such charges as Moses was a leper who was expelled from the country at the head of a band of Egyptian undesirables. Ezekiel the Tragedian's dramatisation of the exodus, the *Exagoge* (sometime between third and early first century B.C.E.; Jacobson, *Exagoge*) combines LXX elements, written in iambic trimeters. Against the claim that the departing Israelites stole from the Egyptians, the *Exagoge* claims that the Israelites were owed a fair wage, and that only the women took away from their willing Egyptian neighbours what each could carry (Allen, 'Ezekiel'). Artapanus, preserved in fragmentary form by Clement of Alexandria and Eusebius, betrays in his vocabulary knowledge of the LXX version (Holladay *Fragments*, pp. 209–25), while giving an apologetic account of the exodus, glorifying Moses to the extent that he depicts him as the founder of Egyptian culture and religion.

Philo of Alexandria comments on Exodus in several works, usually allegorically, such as in *On the Special Laws*. The influence of Platonic and Stoic ideas is strong. Thus, Egyptian oppression stands for bondage to the bodily passions and Israel's departure from Egypt symbolises the migration of the soul from the body. Similarly, Passover is described as a *διάβασις*, a passing, from the body, a process also associated with the crossing of the Red Sea (Pearce, *Land of the Body*, pp. 120–27). Philo's *Life of Moses* is a less symbolic exposition, taking as one theme the Egyptian hatred of strangers. This may reflect contemporary tensions between Hellenistic rulers of Egypt and the vulnerable Jewish community (but see Pearce, *Land of the Body*, p. 206). Philo also emphasises the futility and abomination of Egyptian zoolatry, and also

hints by his condemnation of the worship of the Golden Calf (Exodus 32) at the contemporary bull cult of Mnevis (Pearce, *Land of the Body*, pp. 279–308).

Josephus' treatment of Exodus in *Antiquities* (2.201–3.218) may be influenced by the Hebrew text, as well as by the Greek version. In the aftermath of the Jewish War and the growth of anti-Jewish feeling among non-Jews in the Roman Empire, Josephus gives an apologetic account of events, glorifying both Moses and the Israelite nation, and relying to an extent on material derived from Artapanus. Early in the narrative Josephus gives a long non-biblical episode where Moses is a military leader against Ethiopia, replacing Moses' killing of the Egyptian overseer, and he explains at length the function of the Tabernacle and priesthood, avoiding episodes such as the worship of the Golden Calf. A section of Josephus' apologetic work *Against Apion* (1.223–2.27) deals openly with some of the charges related to the events of Exodus (Spilsbury, 'Contra Apionem').

A brief and allusive treatment of the Exodus story is presented in Wis. 10.15–11.16, probably based on LXX. It focuses particularly on the plagues visited on the wicked and the wilderness wanderings of the God-fearing race, all attributed to the workings of divine Wisdom. The lack of national terms or names in the narrative serves to universalise its message of the conflict between the righteous and the unrighteous (Cheon, *Exodus Story*, p. 150), and the work became very popular with Christians.

There are two main themes that pervade the New Testament citations and allusions to the LXX version of Exodus. First, the commands of the Decalogue are given verbatim singly or in groups, as in the Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 5; Mark 7), and in other places (e.g., Mt. 19.18; Mk 10.19; Lk. 18.20; Rom. 7.7; 13.9; Jas 2.11; for the text-critical difficulties involved, see Steyn, 'Pretexts'). Second, the experiences of the Israelites are recounted, including the passage through the Red Sea, the provision of manna, and the giving of the Law. The contexts in which they appear in the New Testament demonstrate that they were regarded as a central reference point for Jewish identity (John 6.31, 49). Hence the majority of Stephen's speech in Acts 7 is based on events in Exodus. They were also employed for the self-identification of the Christian community who took on (or over: 1 Cor. 10.1-3; Jude 1.5) the identity of

God's people (1 Pet. 2.9; Rev. 1.6; 5.10). In fact, in Heb. 11.26, in the passage on faith, the writer of Hebrews depicts Moses as a proto-Christian. Specific themes from Exodus are also found in Hebrews, principally the Tabernacle and the work of the high priest (Heb. 8.5; ch. 9), and also in Revelation, where the plagues described in Rev. 8.7, 8; 11.6; 16.2, 3, 4, 10, 21 may owe something to the description of the Egyptian plagues.

Before 180 C.E. Melito of Sardis wrote a typological treatment of the Passover narrative, the *Peri Pascha*. In it the biblical text plays a strong role, though often in paraphrased form (Knapp, 'Melito's Use').

Origen's *Homilies on Exodus* are the first sustained exegetical treatment of LXX Exodus in Christian tradition, but they survive only in Latin translation. Developing the Alexandrian allegorical tradition exemplified by Philo, Origen spiritualises the events of the narrative, and, like Philo, tends to diminish the historical element.

Eusebius of Emesa wrote a very different style of commentary on Exodus, as part of his *Commentary on the Octateuch* (now preserved in its full form only in Armenian). Belonging to the Antiochene school of exegesis, which emphasised the literary and historical aspects of the biblical text and rejected allegory, his work resembles the question and answer style of commentary, and he thus comments solely on a limited number of difficult passages (Romeny, 'Early Antiochene').

As far as artistic representations are concerned, it is hard to determine how far they were influenced by the LXX text rather than the New Testament passages on the same themes, or by pre-existing treatments in art. Such an example would be the Christian sarcophagi dating from the late fourth century that depict Moses' crossing of the Red Sea (Elsner, 'Pharaoh's Army', pp. 12–19, 33).

However, a close connection with the LXX text is clearly demonstrated in the illustrations to the treatise of the sixth-century writer Cosmas Indicopleustes. Using some rather ingenious exegesis of certain scriptural passages in Greek (Ps. 103[104].2; Isa. 40.22; Heb. 9.1b-2a; 2 Cor. 5.1), Cosmas argued that the cosmos was modelled on the form of the Tabernacle of Exodus, with the earth having the same proportions as the sacred table (Wolska, *Topographie*). It is also possible that he took literally Origen's comment that the Tabernacle was a figure of the whole world (*Hom. Exod.* 9.4).

Bibliography

- Aejmelaeus, A., 'Septuagintal Translation Techniques—A Solution to the Problem of the Tabernacle Account', in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1993), pp. 116–30.
- 'What Can We Know About the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Septuagint?', in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1993), pp. 77–115.
- Allen, J., 'Ezekiel the Tragedian on the Despoliation of Egypt', *JSP* 17 (2007), pp. 3–19.
- Bogaert, P.-M., 'L'importance de la Septante et du "Monacensis" de la Vetus Latina pour l'exégèse du livre de l'Exode (chap. 35–40)', in M. Vervenne (ed.), *Studies in the Book of Exodus: Redaction—Reception—Interpretation* (BETL 126; Leuven: Louvain University Press, 1996), pp. 399–428.
- 'L'orientation du parvis du sanctuaire dans la version grecque de l'Exode (Ex. 27, 9–13)', *L'antiquité classique* 50 (1981), pp. 79–85.
- Borret, M. (ed.), *Origène, Homélie sur l'Exode* (SC 321; Paris: Cerf, 1985).
- Le Boulluec, A., and P. Sandevor (eds.), *La Bible d'Alexandrie*. Vol. II, *L'Exode* (Paris: Cerf, 1989).
- Brooke, A.E., and N. McLean (eds.), *The Old Testament in Greek: According to the Text of Codex Vaticanus*. Vol. I, *The Octateuch*. Part 2, *Exodus and Leviticus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1909).
- Büchner, D.L. 'Jewish Commentaries and the Septuagint', *JJS* 48 (1997), pp. 250–61.
- 'On the Relationship Between *Mekhilta de Rabbi Ishmael* and Septuagint Exodus 12–23', in B.A. Taylor (ed.), *IX Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Cambridge 1995* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), pp. 403–20.
- Cheon, S., *The Exodus Story in the Wisdom of Solomon: A Study in Biblical Interpretation* (JSPSS 23; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997).
- Elsner, J., "'Pharaoh's Army Got Drowned": Some Reflections on Jewish and Roman Genealogies in Early Christian Art', in H.L. Kessler and D. Nirenberg (eds.), *Judaism and Christian Art: Aesthetic Anxieties from the Catacombs to Colonialism* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2012), pp. 10–44.
- Fraenkel, D., 'Die Quellen der asterisierten Zusätze im zweiten Tabernakelbericht Exod 35–40', in *Studien zur Septuaginta* (Festschrift R. Hanhart; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990), pp. 140–86.
- 'Übersetzungsnorm und Literarische Gestaltung—Spuren Individueller Übersetzungstechnik in Exodus 25ff. + 35ff', in L.J. Greenspoon (ed.), *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Paris 1992* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), pp. 73–87.
- Gera, D.L., 'Translating Hebrew Poetry in Greek Poetry: The Case of Exodus 15', *BIOSCS* 40 (2007), pp. 107–20.
- Gooding, D.W., *The Account of the Tabernacle. Translation and Textual Problems of the Greek Exodus* (Texts and Studies, Contributions to Biblical and Patristic Literature 6; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959).

- ‘Two Possible Examples of Midrashic Interpretation in the Septuagint Exodus’, in J. Schreiner (ed.), *Wort, Lied, Und Gottesspruch* (Festschrift J. Ziegler; Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1972), pp. 39–48.
- Gruen, E.S., *Heritage and Hellenism: The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998).
- Gurtner, D.M., *Exodus: A Commentary on the Greek Text of Codex Vaticanus* (Septuagint Commentary Series; Leiden: Brill, 2013).
- Hacham, N., ‘The Letter of Aristeeas: A New Exodus Story?’, *JSJ* 36 (2005), pp. 1–20.
- Holladay, C.R., *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*, vol. I (SBLTT 20, Pseudepigrapha Series 10; Chico: Scholars Press, 1983).
- Honigman, S., ‘The Narrative Function of the King and the Library in the Letter of Aristeeas’, in T. Rajak, S. Pearce, J. Aitken, and J. Dines (eds.), *Jewish Perspectives on Hellenistic Rulers* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007), pp. 128–46.
- Horst, P.W. van der, ‘“Gij zult van goden geen kwaad spreken”. De Septuaginta-vertaling van Exodus 22:27(28), haar achtergrond en invloed’, *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* 46 (1992), pp. 192–98 [reprinted in *Studies over het Jodendom in de Oudheid* (Kampen, 1992), pp. 142–51].
- Jacobson, H., *The Exagoge of Ezekiel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).
- Knapp, H.M., ‘Melito’s Use of Scripture in “Peri Pascha”: Second-Century Typology’, *VC* 54 (2000), pp. 343–74.
- Lemmelijn, B., ‘The So-Called “Major Expansions” in SamP, 4QpaleoExod^m and 4QExod^d Exod 7:14–11:10. On the Edge Between Textual Criticism and Literary Criticism’, in B.A. Taylor (ed.), *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo 1998* (SBLSCS 51; Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001), pp. 429–39.
- O’Connell, K.G., *The Theodotianic Revision of the Book of Exodus: A Contribution to the Study of the Early History of the Transmission of the Old Testament in Greek* (HSM 3; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1972).
- Orlinsky, H., ‘The Septuagint as Holy Writ and the Philosophy of the Translators’, *HUCA* 46 (1975), pp. 89–114.
- Pearce, S.J.K., *The Land of the Body: Studies in Philo’s Representation of Egypt* (WUNT 28; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007).
- Perkins, L., ‘“The Lord is a Warrior”—“The Lord Who Shatters Wars”: Exod 15:3 and Jdt 9:7; 16:2’, *BIOSCS* 40 (2007), pp. 121–37.
- Robertson Smith, W., *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church: Twelve Lectures On Biblical Criticism* (2nd ed.; London: Black, 1892).
- Romeny, R.B. ter Haar, ‘Early Antiochene Commentaries on Exodus’, in E.A. Livingstone (ed.), *Studia Patristica*. Vol. XXX, *Biblica et Apocrypha, Ascetica, Liturgica* (Leuven: Peeters, 1997), pp. 114–19.
- Salvesen, A., *Symmachus in the Pentateuch* (JSSMS 15; Manchester: University of Manchester Press, 1991).
- Sommer, B.D., ‘Translation as Commentary: The Case of the Septuagint to Exodus 32–33’, *Textus* 20 (2000), pp. 43–60.

The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint

- Spilsbury, P., 'Contra Apionem and Antiquitates Judaicae: Points of Contact', in L.H. Feldman and J.R. Levison (eds.), *Josephus' Contra Apionem: Studies in Its Character and Context* (Leiden: Brill, 1996), pp. 348–68.
- Steyn, G.J., 'Pretexts of the Second Table of the Decalogue and Early Christian Intertexts', *Neot* 30 (1996), pp. 451–64.
- Wade, M.L., *Consistency of Translation Techniques in the Tabernacle Accounts of Exodus in the Old Greek* (SBLSCS 49; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003).
- Wevers, J.W., 'How the Greek Exodus Rationalized the Text', in E. Robbins and S. Sandal (eds.), *Corolla Torontonensis* (Festschrift R.M. Smith; Toronto: TSAR, 1994), pp. 47–57.
- Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus* (SBLSCS 30; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990).
- 'PreOrigen Recensional Activity in the Greek Exodus', in D. Fraenkel, U. Quast, and J.W. Wevers (eds.), *Studien zur Septuaginta* (Festschrift R. Hanhart; MSU 20; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990), pp. 121–39.
- Text History of the Greek Exodus* (MSU 21; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992).
- Wevers, J.W., and U. Quast (eds.), *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum*. Vol. II.1, *Exodus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991).
- Wolska, W., *La Topographie Chrétienne de Cosmas Indicopleustes* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1962).

Leviticus

Anssi Voitila

Editions

(a) Standard Greek Editions

Göttingen, vol. II.2, *Leviticus* (Wevers and Quast, 1986).

Cambridge, vol. I.2, *Exodus and Leviticus* (Brooke and McLean, 1909).

Rahlfs-Hanhart, vol. I, pp. 158–209.

Swete, vol. I, pp. 188–250.

(b) Other Editions

Qumran Cave 4: IV: Palaeo-Hebrew and Greek Biblical Manuscripts
(Skehan *et al.*, 1992).

(c) Modern Translations

NETS (Perkins, 2007), pp. 82–106.

LXX.D (Hertog and Vahrenhorst, 2009), pp. 98–132.

Bd'A 3 (Harlé and Pralon, 1988).

La Biblia Griega, vol. I (Fernández Marcos *et al.*, 2008), pp. 227–90.

I. General Characteristics

The third book of the Pentateuch is comprised primarily of cultic legislation. It discusses rituals, sacrifices and impurities, or, in other words, regulations concerning relations with God and with one another. Following Milgrom, we may state that ‘the careful reader will find an intricate web of values’ (Milgrom, *Leviticus*, p. 1). Hence the Greek translation establishes the ritual and ethical language of Greek-speaking Judaism from the third century B.C.E. onwards and influences later Jewish writers.

This book contains the commandment of love (Lev. 19.18). Perhaps the most well-known of its sentences is cited by Jesus: ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτὸν ‘You shall love your neighbour as yourself’ (Mt. 19.19). In addition, we find such topics as the Day of Atonement (ch. 16), the food laws (ch. 11), the Jubilee regulations (ch. 25) and holiness as a way of life.

The title of the Greek version (βιβλίον) Λευιτικόν (‘[the book concerning matters relating to] the Levites’)—and the Latin *Leviticus*—originates in the address to the priests, not only to Levites, who are mentioned only twice at the end of the work (25.32, 33), but priests in general. The earliest use of the title appears in *Jubilees* (frg. C.64: ἐν τῷ Λευιτικῷ) and it is repeated in the works of Philo (Philo, *Leg. All.* 2.105 ἐν Λευιτικῷ; *Plant.* 26 ἐν Λευιτικῇ βίβλῳ; *Her.* 251 ἐν τῷ Λευιτικῷ). The Greek title is in line with tradition: in the Mishnah the book is called *Torat kohanim* ‘Torah of the priests’ (*m. Meg.* 3.5) and this title is attached to the *Sifra* (legal midrash on Leviticus), although the book is actually addressed to all Israel, to everyone of the cultic community, not only to the priests.

II. Time and Place of Composition

How many translators were there? Thackeray and later Huber have defended the theory that there were two translators for Greek Leviticus and that the translation should be divided in two, between chs. 15 and 16. The varying distribution of certain words, like the two forms of the modal particle ἄν and ἐάν, κυρίῳ and τῷ κυρίῳ, ἔσθω and ἐσθίω, φάγομαι and ἔδομαι, has been used as evidence (Thackeray, ‘Bisection’; Huber, *Untersuchungen*, pp. 95–98). Aejmelaeus’s analysis of the distribution of the free renderings of Hebrew parataxis shows that, for the most part, differences are not due to two translators but to the content of any one section, such as narrative vs. legal material (Aejmelaeus, *Parataxis*, pp. 159–69).¹ The narrative texts have inspired the translator whereas the laws were perhaps not so familiar. The translator’s close rendering of the legal sections might indicate the material was more difficult to

1. Her statistics for Leviticus are as follows: δέ 18 (1st part)/12 (2nd part); part.coni. 16/5; various conjunctions 3/5; omission of apodotic *waw* 13/30.

understand. For Leviticus, which consists almost entirely of legal material, her statistics do not show significant differences; free renderings are extremely rare and are not confined to any one section of the book (p. 166).² Hence there does not seem to be good reason to presume two translators for the Greek Leviticus but rather one (Wevers, ‘Göttingen Pentateuch’, p. 57).

Leviticus was translated at the same time as the rest of the Pentateuch, commonly dated to the third century B.C.E. in Alexandria (*BGS*, pp. 56–58; contrast Clancy, ‘The Date’). It is probable that the Pentateuchal books were translated in one go, one after another starting from Genesis and ending in Deuteronomy. Den Hertog has proposed that Genesis–Exodus–Deuteronomy were translated first and Leviticus–Numbers later. He points to related words appearing in similar contexts, in most cases from Leviticus and Deuteronomy, and suggests there was a greater call for Genesis–Exodus–Deuteronomy in the translators’ community. These books alongside Psalms and Isaiah were the ones in most use at Qumran and cited in the New Testament (den Hertog, ‘Erwägungen’).

III. Language

The language of the Greek Pentateuch is an example of early Koine Greek, seen in its vocabulary and morphology as well as in the spheres of syntax and morphosyntax, when there is no interference from the source language owing to the translation technique (see Numbers, § III). Different assessments, nonetheless, have been made of the Greek of Leviticus, but these are dependent on the characterisation of the translator and his technique (see § IV below).

There appears to have been no fixed equivalents for various cultic terms, and the translator applied the same Greek word for various Hebrew sacrifices and different Greek words for one and the same Hebrew one. The title of the high priest is emblematic: in Lev. 4.3, the high priest is called ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς, while in Lev. 21.10 he is ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ

2. There is only one exception, the apodotic τ . In chs. 1–15 the conjunction has been omitted in 13 out of 55 cases; in chs. 16–27, in 30 out of 56 cases. The results are immaterial when the omissions are not evenly distributed in the sections: in ch. 27 there are 13 omissions out of 18; in ch. 20, 3/4; in ch. 25, 3/12; whereas in ch. 7 we find 4/5; ch. 13 2/19; ch. 15 2/8. See Aejmelaeus, *Parataxis*, pp. 167–68.

μέγας, as in the Hebrew הכהן הגדול. The Day of Atonement is rendered ἡμέρα τοῦ ἐξίλασμοῦ in Lev. 23.27, but ἡμέρα ἰλασμοῦ at 25.9, although the names of festivals as given in Exodus are normally followed: σάββατον ‘sabbath’, πάσχα ‘Passover’, ἑορτὴ τῶν ἀζύμων ‘Feast of Unleavened Bread’, ἑορτὴ τῶν σκηνῶν ‘Feast of Tabernacles’. Meanwhile κάρπωμα renders both אשה ‘offerings by fire’ and עלה ‘sacrifice’ as well as קרבן ‘offering’ once. קרבן is most frequently rendered by δῶρον ‘gift’, a rendering too for ‘the bread of God’. Sometimes it is more systematic. In Genesis and Exodus δῶρον has been reserved for מנחה ‘food offering’ (of vegetables; Marx, *Les systèmes*, pp. 26–28), while זבח ‘animal sacrificed by slaughtering’ (Marx, *Les systèmes*, pp. 21–26) has as its equivalent θυσία ‘animal sacrifice’—קרבן is not found in Genesis and Exodus at all. In Leviticus, on the other hand, both מנחה and זבח have been translated by θυσία, despite the paradox of ‘food offering’ being rendered as ‘animal sacrifice’. Admittedly, קרבן/δῶρον often occurs in close succession to מנחה/θυσία preventing a consistent translation method in Genesis and Exodus. In Leviticus, θυσία is used to render אשה as well. The noun ἡ πλημμέλεια ‘error’ renders the Hebrew אשם ‘guilt offering’ (Lev. 7.1, 5 [6.31, 35], etc.) when it refers to the injury caused to others, whereas ἀμαρτία ‘fault, sin’ is used of an injury affecting the sinner himself (Daniel, *Recherches*, 315). Leviticus is the first to render the Hebrew word טמא (‘unclean’) by ἀκάθαρτος; in Genesis and Exodus טהור (‘pure’) was rendered by καθαρός and טמא by μὴ καθαρός ‘not pure’. The alternative μιαρός ‘stained, defiled with blood’ was not used; only the related verb μιάειν occurs for טמא (Piel)/ללח (Piel) (*Bd’A* 3, pp. 30–32).

The range of equivalents may indicate that in the Diasporan community the Jerusalem temple cult was not of primary importance. It may also show that Leviticus was not read as often as the other books, at least not for information on the cult, the result being that the translator was not acquainted with the terminology. This seems unlikely when Leviticus was used by Philo in Alexandria and it was extensively copied in Qumran, a community that had excluded itself from the Jerusalem temple. Furthermore, Leviticus contains regulations that do not only have a cultic bearing, but inform on relations with and separation from non-Jews, like dietary and Sabbath laws, and the regulations for festivals and against other cults (Leviticus 11, 19 and 26).

The translator or his community drew upon pagan religious language for their Greek cultic vocabulary. If the sacrifice in question contained something ‘especially Israelite’, he imparted a ‘Jewish flavour’, just as the other Pentateuchal translators (Daniel, *Recherches*, p. 364; Chamberlain, ‘Cultic Vocabulary’; see also Vahrenhorst, ‘Greek Religious’). For example, the burnt offering $\eta\lambda\gamma$ is translated by $\delta\lambdaοκάρπωσις$ (already in Genesis), $\delta\lambdaοκάρπωμα$ (first in Lev. 16.2, 24 *bis*; Num. 15.3), $\delta\lambdaοκαύτωμα$ (first in Exodus), $κάρπωμα$ (first in Exodus), and $κάρπωσις$ (only in Leviticus). The words $\delta\lambdaοκαύτωμα/\delta\lambdaοκαύτωσις$ are neologisms in the Greek Pentateuch, the common Greek word being $\delta\lambdaόκαυτον$. The reason for this choice of words appears to be the fact that the Hebrew $\eta\lambda\gamma$ was a special kind of offering, thus needing its own term, while the word family $\delta\lambdaοκαύτ-$ was close enough to the common Greek term for a burnt offering to be understood (Daniel, *Recherches*, pp. 249–54; Vahrenhorst, ‘Greek Religious’, p. 129). The translator lived in a Greek environment, but the Greek-speaking community in Alexandria had existed only for a short time. Therefore, if the translator wanted to use words that his audience would understand, he had no other alternative than to employ ‘pagan’ terminology, such as $\delta\ \acute{\alpha}\rho\chiιερεύς$ ‘the high priest’, in use in Hellenistic cults.

IV. Translation and Composition

Frankel considers the translator an exegete, a faithful translator who did not take into account the requirements of the Greek language (Frankel, *Einfluss*, p. 122). Thackeray, however, characterised the language of the Pentateuch, Leviticus included, as ‘good κοινή Greek’ (Thackeray, *Grammar*, p. 13). According to Aejmelaeus, the translator ‘seems to be recklessly free in small details, without, however, mastering the larger context’ (Aejmelaeus, *Parataxis*, p. 181). Wevers similarly states that ‘Lev is more of an isolate type of translation than a contextual one’. As examples of the translator’s poor grammar, he gives $\acute{\alpha}\nu\delta\rho\iota\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\delta\rho\iota\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\ \gammaένηται$ (15.2) as referring ‘to any man to whom there should happen’, $κοίτη\ σπέρματος$ (15.16, 17) or $\thetaανάτῳ\ θανατούσθῳ$ (20.2). ‘A monolingual Greek reader would not readily understand such oddities’ (Wevers, *Notes Leviticus*, p. ix). The characterisation of a translator, however, depends on the criteria we are using, on the text type—as noted

regarding the alleged two translators—and on other factors, as many studies on various syntactical phenomena in the Greek Leviticus have been able to demonstrate.

Soisalon-Soininen (*Die Infinitive*) sought criteria that showed a translator mastering the larger context and was able to show that Leviticus was more literal than the other books in the Pentateuch. He recorded the frequency of subordinate clauses translated by the *participium coniunctum*, the rendering of הַ + inf. constr. of purpose by the anarthrous or genitive arthrous infinitive (the latter being more literal), and of the Greek infinitive not rendering a Hebrew infinitive. In rendering of Hebrew parataxis, Leviticus appears to be one of the most literal, but not always the most literal of the Pentateuchal books (Aejmelaeus, *Parataxis*, pp. 176–81). Hence Aejmelaeus concluded that the differences between Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy are not so significant. Genesis and Exodus clearly form a group of their own, particularly in their use of δέ (25.5% and 16.4%, respectively, compared to 2.7–2.1 % in Leviticus to Deuteronomy) and the omission of the apodotic ו (55.4% and 78.1% compared to 38.7%–30.3%). This differs from Soisalon-Soininen’s criteria, which showed an obvious difference between Leviticus and the other Pentateuchal books.

In contrast, Sollamo (*Renderings*, pp. 280–89) presents a different picture, using as points for comparison the frequency of free renderings, the frequency of slavish renderings, and the degree of stereotyping in translating the so-called semiprepositions. Leviticus contains relatively more free renderings than Genesis, Numbers and Deuteronomy,³ and there are fewer slavish renderings in Leviticus than in Exodus,⁴ although the tendency to use stereotyping is higher in Leviticus than elsewhere.⁵ Although Aejmelaeus explains that the translator of Leviticus is free in rendering individual words (Aejmelaeus, *Parataxis*, p. 180), it is disputed whether a preposition is just a word in the translation process. Is it not a syntactic element that demands more than just mastering a few words?

3. Leviticus 35.9%; Genesis 27.2%; Numbers 25.5%; Deuteronomy 28.2%.

4. Leviticus 9.9%; Exodus 20.1%; Genesis 29.2%; Numbers 28.2%; Deuteronomy 42.1%.

5. Leviticus 64.1%; Genesis 50.0%; Exodus 43.1%, Numbers 60.9%; Deuteronomy 54.5%.

Where the item to be rendered is short—as the Hebrew genitival relation, or the noun with a possessive suffix—our translator is freer in his translations. This verb ἔχειν ‘to have’, which does not have a direct equivalent in the Hebrew, is an interesting example as it reflects not only a lexical problem, but one of syntax and style. The translator uses this verb as an equivalent of יהיה ל־ more frequently (2/29) than the translator of Exodus (1/31) and almost as often as that of Genesis (3/64). Other expressions are translated by this verb too, such as at Lev. 21.23: כי מום בו – ὅτι μῶμον ἔχει. Short translation units did not necessarily produce more idiomatic Greek. Thus, in the case of the enclitic pronouns, the pronoun infrequently precedes the word it is governing, even though the position before the governing word prevails in Greek.

It is often argued that the translator shows a marked tendency towards variation when rendering individual words, particularly the technical cultic terms that are so numerous in the book. This is true in so far as our translator, as well as the other translators of the Pentateuch, did not strive for consistency by rendering all occurrences of a given word by the same Greek equivalent. It has been shown that despite choosing several different equivalents for one Hebrew word, this translation still shows a clear preference for a common equivalent (*stereotyping*) (cf. Sollamo, *Renderings*, p. 283). For ‘reasonable variation’, the rendering of חרב ‘sword’ in ch. 26 may serve as an example. This noun is used as a metaphor for violence in the Hebrew text, and the translator has partly remained literal by using μάχαιρα ‘sword’ (26.8, 25, 33), and partly translated the metaphor by using πόλεμος ‘war’ (26.6, 36, 37) and φόνος ‘massacre, slaughter (by the sword)’ (26.7). The Hebrew word חטאת may signify ‘sin’ or ‘sin-offering’. The former sense is rendered by ἁμαρτία, but as an equivalent of the sin-offering it ‘would make much of Leviticus unintelligible to a Greek reader. So when חטאת meant “sin-offering” he created a new idiom: (τὸ) τῆς ἁμαρτίας or (τὸ) περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας’ (Wevers, ‘Göttingen Pentateuch’, p. 59). Yet תנופה, ‘a wave offering’, reveals another side of our translator (*Notes Leviticus*, pp. 94–95; *Bd’A* 3, p. 42). The word has been rendered by four different words: δόμα ‘gift’ (7.20[30]); ἐπίθεμα ‘something that has been put over [i.e. cover], in addition’ (7.24[34]; 8.29; 14.24; 23.15, 17, 20);⁶ ἀφάιρεμα

6. NETS: ‘addition’; LEH: ‘heave-offering?, deposit?’, which is taken from *Bd’A* 3, p. 42.

‘share or portion taken away/dedicated portion’ (8.27; 9.21; 14.21); and ἀφόρισμα ‘something set apart’ (10.14, 15 *bis*; 14.12). These last two are borrowed from Exodus (29.24, 26, 27; 35.22; 39.2, 6 LXX). An example of his ‘recklessness’ may be seen at 4.3. A correct interpretation in the larger context is the translation ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς ‘the high priest’, an equivalent of the anointed priest ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς ὁ κεχρισμένος, הכהן המשיח, but then in vv. 5 and 16 this expression is rendered as ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ χριστός, even though the Hebrew is the same in the MT at least. As stated by Aejmelaeus, owing to the lack of dictionaries and word lists (concordances), the translator was constantly looking for a correct solution, perhaps inventing the equivalents every time anew. Once or twice he went astray (e.g., Lev. 25.27 and 27.21, in Aejmelaeus, *On the Trail*, pp. 66–67), but mostly he succeeded in writing intelligible Greek. Vahrenhorst (following Dorival, ‘Dire en grec’) argues that the translators used variation because several Greek words allowed them to express more fully the one Hebrew concept (Vahrenhorst, ‘Greek Religious’, pp. 133–35). This is not convincing, however, considering that a Greek reader without Hebrew would not know that the same concept was being referred to.

It may be concluded that literalness increased from book to book, Genesis–Exodus being the most free and Deuteronomy the most literal (Aejmelaeus, *On the Trail*, p. 26). Leviticus is often situated between the freer and the more literal books of the Pentateuch, depending on the criteria used. Its translation technique oscillates between very free and extremely literal. This description, however, is very general and does not do justice to the details of the translation. It has become clear that the translator sometimes used good free equivalents, while at times he misunderstood his source text. He was better, though not always exceptional, in rendering shorter translation units than in mastering larger contexts. He intended to render his source text into understandable Greek for his audience. He was literal partly because he was translating legal texts, which comprise the majority of Leviticus, and was perhaps unfamiliar with these sections if they were not always read in the translator’s community. In addition, the syntax of the legal material presents little variation and, thus, little opportunity for variation in Greek syntax.

V. Key Text-Critical Issues

a. The Original Greek Text

According to Wevers, the best witnesses to the original Greek translation (Old Greek) are the two codices *Vaticanus* (B) and *Alexandrinus* (A), the minuscule 121 and the manuscript groups *x* and *b*. It is difficult to establish the original text for Greek Leviticus. First, the codices B and A constitute practically the oldest manuscript witnesses we have. There are few older papyri: Rahlfs 858 (= P.Heid[elberg] Gr. 945) and the small Qumran fragments, 801 (= 4QLXXLev^a) and 802 (= 4QLXXLev^b). Contemporary with B and A are the papyri 931, 936, 947 and 954, but they are, however, ‘too fragmentary to be of much use for establishing the text history of Leviticus’ (Wevers, *Text Hist. Leviticus*, p. 59). Furthermore, both A and B often agree with each other over against the majority of textual traditions and, on occasions, attest secondary readings. Second, the translator did not follow a precise translation technique but he displayed a certain tendency to variation (*Text Hist. Leviticus*, pp. 59, 72), as shown above.

In addition, a new discovery not included in Wevers’s analysis is the codex with Rahlfs’s number 830, published by De Troyer (De Troyer, ‘Leviticus’; Schøyen Collection MS 2649). In an article, she concludes:

MS 2649 firmly stands in the tradition of the Old Greek text of the book of Leviticus. It contains some pre-Hexaplaric corrections towards the MT. It also has some readings, albeit very few, in common with the readings of the early Jewish revisers. Finally, it has some readings in common with the texts of the Judean Desert. As the papyrus is dated to the end of the second century C.E. or the beginning of the third century C.E., it is a very important witness for the Old Greek text. (De Troyer, ‘On the Name’, p. 331)

The two Qumran LXX manuscripts antedate all the other witnesses by three or four centuries. 4QpapLXXLev^b (4Q120 = Rahlfs 802) is highly fragmentary (‘hundred small fragments of papyrus’), and ‘could reasonably be assigned to the first century BCE’. The papyrus contains a ‘number of variants that appear to be minor but may still offer some clues about the early Greek text’, and one significant variant, which is very interesting: ‘for the divine name it reads ΙΑΩ at Lev. 4.7’ (Metso

and Ulrich, 'Old Greek', p. 265). It comprises parts of Lev. 1.11–6.5[5.24 LXX] (DJD IX, pp. 11, 167–86; Metso and Ulrich, 'Old Greek', p. 257). On the other hand, in 4QLXXLev^a (4Q119 = Rahlfs 801), which dates 'from about the late second or the first century BCE', there are fifteen variants from the critical text of the Göttingen edition, of which seven are unique and in three cases the manuscript is aligned with only a few other manuscripts, but in agreement with Qumran Hebrew Leviticus manuscript(s) and SP. None of these readings was selected for the critical text.

The variant readings do not reflect a *Vorlage* deviating from the MT, but they are a free if rather literal translation of the proto-MT. There are two solutions to this problem (DJD IX): either the text form represented in later LXX MSS is a revision towards the proto-MT, or the Qumran LXX scrolls testify to recensional activity; both cannot be possible. Metso and Ulrich are inclined to accept the former alternative, as does Van der Louw ('Translation and Writing'). Wevers has upheld the view that the Qumran fragments are representatives of Palestinian recensional activity known also from the Minor Prophets scroll from Naḥal Ḥever (Wevers, 'Dead Sea').

We may conclude from all this that the critical text of the Göttingen edition represents not necessarily the original text but the 'prerecensional text', a text form as it was before the so-called Hexaplaric and Lucianic recensions (*Text Hist. Leviticus*, p. 72).

b. The Parent Text

The Greek text testifies to approximately 600 deviations from the MT (*Bd'A 3*, p. 24). Most of them are not very important, but there are also some major differences. The LXX text sometimes allies with Qumran manuscript(s) and SP or stands alone against the MT. 'The Old Greek is a faithful translation of its ancient Hebrew parent text, and...that parent text was similar to but not identical with the one that eventually became the Masoretic text' (Metso, 'Evidence', p. 514; cf. Metso and Ulrich, 'Old Greek', pp. 259–61). There is no reason, however, to assume that there was more than one text edition of Leviticus in circulation at the time, since it is possible that the priests in Jerusalem 'had carefully guarded the transmission of the text' (Metso, 'Evidence', pp. 510–11; see also Metso and Ulrich, 'Old Greek', pp. 257–58).

VI. Ideology and Exegesis

Caution should be exercised regarding the extent of the translator's exegesis. Wevers catalogues activities by which the translator changed the Hebrew text: he clarifies, rationalises, corrects (avoiding misinterpretations on the part of the reader), misunderstands, harmonises, updates and reinterprets his parent text (Wevers, *Notes Leviticus*, pp. xxii–xxv; cf. Frankel, *Einfluss*). Judging from the way our translator did his work—literal and faithful, working on short segments—a far-reaching interpretative activity does not appear plausible. Wevers, as with Harlé and Pralon (*Bd'A 3*, pp. 14–25), creates the impression that the translator rendered the MT and is therefore to blame whenever there is a deviation from it. However, the elements seen as proof of the translator's exegesis may well be witnesses to a *Vorlage* differing from the MT (Zipor, 'The Greek Version'; Metso and Ulrich, 'Old Greek').

A revealing case is the time of the Feast of Weeks. In Lev. 23.11, according to MT, the offering should be made on the 'day after the sabbath' (ממחרת השבת), which in the LXX it is 'on the day after the first' (τῆς ἐπαύριον τῆς πρώτης) (*Notes Leviticus*, p. 370). There was disagreement on when this day should be celebrated in ancient Judaism. The date in the LXX need not be viewed as exegesis on the translator's part, because the date τῆς ἐπαύριον τῶν σαββάτων that agrees with MT appears immediately afterwards in v. 15, referring to the feast in v. 11.

Among examples collected by Wevers, an interesting case is 'the bread of your/his/their God', לחם אלהיכם/ו/ך/הם, always with a suffix, where the translator 'assiduously avoids the notion of the "bread of God" as though God might be in need of food' (similarly, *Bd'A 3*, p. 93). In these cases, לחם is either not rendered at all (3.11, 16) or by δῶρα (21.6, 8, 17, 22; 22.15). A less intentional reason on the part of the translator is possible. He did not render the word לחם in the first two cases because it simply did not stand in his parent text, and in the other ones he either considered לחם as an offering of some sort, or he read קרבן in his source text, the standard equivalent of which is ἀρπωμα (cf. Daniel, *Recherches*, pp. 140–41, on the targums).

In the ritual procedure (Lev. 1.5, 11; 3.13; 4.24, 29, 33) in which a layman brings an animal offering, he must first lay his hands on its head and then slaughter (singular) it, and the Aaronides are to sprinkle its

blood. The Greek mostly reads the plural verb *σφάζουσιν* for slaughtering, which Wevers explains as implying a priestly slaughter for the sin offering (*Notes Leviticus*, p. xxii; likewise already *Bd'A 3*, p. 86). The problem is that the plural does not always occur, as in Lev. 3.2, 8. On one occasion the Masoretic plural corresponds to a singular in Greek (Lev. 22.28). In Lev. 6.18 the translator has the plural—in MT the second person masculine singular—which creates confusion regarding the actual subject, whereas second person singular would have made the priests the clear referent. In Lev. 4.15 the subject is plural even in MT but the verb remains in the singular. A second problem is that the translator has proven to be faithful such that so major a departure from the parent text would not be typical. Furthermore, why would an Alexandrian Jew bother himself with these kinds of priestly matters when he was not otherwise well-informed on sacrificial practices? All this should make it at least possible that the change from singular into plural originated in the source text rather than by the hand of the translator.

A final example from Wevers is Lev. 26.33, in which ‘the picture of deity actually drawing a sword from the sheath (to chase) after his people was offensive to the translator’ (*Notes Leviticus*, p. xxiv; further examples, see Zipor ‘Notes’, pp. 328–37, and ‘Greek Version’, pp. 551–62). This reading is tempting, although just earlier in v. 25 the translator had God bring a sword against his people. As we have already seen, the translator is able to vary the equivalents of the Hebrew word ‘sword’ in Greek.

Not all the cases put forward by Wevers may be explained as a possible deviation in the parent text. In each instance it should at least be considered a possibility. The Alexandrian translator naturally understands his source text in a certain way—he interprets it—but to call this intentional exegesis is a different matter. There should be more evidence based on thorough study of the translator’s working method and of the witnesses of both the Greek and Hebrew textual material.

VII. Reception History

Greek Leviticus, as the whole Pentateuch, had an impact on other books of the Bible later translated into Greek. The Pentateuch served as a lexicon and a concordance (see Tov, ‘Impact’). Other Greek-speaking

Jewish authors referred to Leviticus in its Greek form as well. The *Letter of Aristeeas* in the second century B.C.E. praises the temple cult in Jerusalem and explains the ethical purposes behind the dietary laws (*Bd'A 3*, p. 25). Pseudo-Phocylides seems to depend on LXX Leviticus, particularly on Leviticus 18 and 20, when he teaches sexual morality (Barclay, *Jews*, pp. 339, 342, 344). Philo frequently comments on the text of Leviticus in its Greek form, particularly in his *De specialibus legibus*. This commentary does not treat the laws in the order they appear in Leviticus, but shows how its prescriptions derive from the Decalogue (the special laws). Philo was convinced that the laws might also be explained allegorically (*De Josepho 28; Spec. III.178*; see *Bd'A 3*, p. 26; Metso, 'Evidence', pp. 516–17). Jewish use of the Greek version is shown by its presence in cave 4 at Qumran, but its precise role and who used it remain obscure.

In the New Testament there are 22 citations and numerous allusions to Leviticus, the most famous of them ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτὸν occurring ten times. Paul employs the sacrificial imagery of Greek Leviticus when he describes for Diaspora Jews the meaning of the death of a human. In 2 Cor. 5.21, the death of Christ is the ἀμαρτία 'sin-offering' from Lev. 4.33, and in Rom. 3.25 (Dunn, *Romans*, p. 180) he is the ἱλαστήριον 'propitiatory offering' (Lev. 16.14), reflecting Hebrew כפרת 'the covering plate (of the ark?)'. The Letter to the Hebrews uses the imagery of the anointed (ὁ χριστός) high priest on the Day of the Atonement, notably in Heb. 9.22 (Lev. 17.11), to explain the death of Christ. The church fathers develop the metaphorical and allegorical interpretations established by Paul and Hebrews, deepening the priestly and sacerdotal understanding of the death of Christ (*Bd'A 3*, pp. 27–28).

Bibliography

- Aejmelaeus, A., *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays* (CBET 50; rev. and exp. ed.; Leuven: Peeters, 2007).
- Parataxis in the Septuagint* (AASF, B Diss 31; Helsinki: Suomalainen tiedeakatemia, 1982).
- Barclay, J.M.G., *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora from Alexander to Trajan (332 BCE–117 CE)* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996).
- Chamberlain, G.A., 'Cultic Vocabulary in the Septuagint', *BIOSCS* 27 (1994), pp. 21–28.

The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint

- Clancy, F., 'The Date of LXX', *SJOT* 16 (2002), pp. 207–25.
- Daniel, S., *Recherches sur le vocabulaire du culte dans la Septante* (Etudes et commentaires 61; Paris: Klincksieck, 1966).
- De Troyer, K., 'Leviticus', D. Minutoli and R. Pintaudi (eds.), *Papyri Graecae Schøyen (PSchøyen I)* (Papyrologica Florentina/Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection; Florence: Gonnelli, 2010), pp. 3–68.
- 'On the Name of God in the Old Greek Schøyen Leviticus Papyrus', in A. Voitila and J. Jokiranta (eds.), *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls* (Festschrift R. Sollamo; JSJSup 126; Leiden: Brill, 2008), pp. 329–37.
- Den Hertog, C.G., 'Erwägungen zur relativen Chronologie der Bücher Levitikus und Deuteronomium innerhalb der Pentateuchübersetzung', in S. Kreuzer and J.P. Lesch (eds.), *Im Brennpunkt: Die Septuaginta* (BWANT 161; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2004), pp. 216–28.
- Dorival, G., "'Dire en grec les choses juives": Quelques choix lexicaux du Pentateuque de la Septante', *REG* 109 (1996), pp. 527–47.
- Dunn, J.G., *Romans 1–8* (WBC 38A; Dallas: Word Books, 1988).
- Frankel, Z., *Über den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik* (Leipzig: Verlag von Joh. Ambr. Barth, 1851).
- Harlé, P., and D. Pralon (eds.), *La Bible d'Alexandrie*. Vol. III, *Le Lévitique* (Paris: Cerf, 1988).
- Huber, K., *Untersuchungen über den Sprachcharakter des griechischen Leviticus* (Giessen: Verlag Töpelmann, 1916).
- Louw, T. van der, 'Translation and Writing in 4QLXXLev^a', in T. Römer (ed.), *The Books of Leviticus and Numbers* (BETHL 215; Leuven: Peeters, 2008), pp. 383–97.
- Marx, A., *Les systèmes sacrificiels de l'Ancien Testament: Formes et fonctions du culte sacrificiel à Yhwh* (VTSup 105; Leiden: Brill, 2005).
- Metso, S., 'Evidence from the Qumran Scrolls', in J. Pakkala and M. Nissinen (eds.), *Houses Full of All Good Things: Essays in Memory of Timo Veijola* (PFES 95; Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, 2008), pp. 507–19.
- Metso, S., and E. Ulrich, 'The Old Greek Translation of Leviticus', in R. Rendtorff and R.A. Kugler (eds.), *The Book of Leviticus* (VTSup 93; Leiden: Brill, 2003), pp. 247–68.
- Soisalon-Soininen, I., *Die Infinitive in der Septuaginta* (AASF B 132,1; Helsinki: Suomalainen tiedeakatemia, 1965).
- Sollamo, R., *Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions in the Septuagint* (AASF B Diss 19; Helsinki: Suomalainen tiedeakatemia, 1979).
- Repetition of the Possessive Pronouns in the Septuagint* (SBLSCS 40; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995).
- Thackeray, H.St.J., 'The Bisection of Books in Primitive Septuagint MSS', *JTS* 9 (1909), pp. 88–98.

- Tov, E., 'The Impact of the LXX Translation of the Pentateuch on the Translation of the Other Books', in P. Casetti, O. Keel, and A. Schenker (eds.), *Mélanges Dominique Barthélemy: Etudes bibliques offertes à l'occasion de son 60^e anniversaire* (OBO 38; Fribourg: Editions Universitaires, 1981), pp. 578–92.
- Varenhorst, M., 'Greek Religious and Cultic Terminology in the LXX Pentateuch', in D. Brakke, A.-C. Jacobsen, and J. Ulrich (eds.), *Beyond Reception: Mutual Influences between Antique Religion, Judaism, and Early Christianity* (ECCA 1; Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2006), pp. 117–35.
- Wevers, J.W., 'The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Septuagint', *BIOSCS* 38 (2005), pp. 1–24.
- 'The Göttingen Pentateuch: Some Post-Partem Reflections', in C.E. Cox (ed.), *VII Congress of the IOSCS, Leuven 1989* (SBLSCS 31; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991), pp. 51–60.
- Notes on the Greek Text of Leviticus* (SBLSCS 44; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1997).
- Text History of the Greek Leviticus* (MSU 19; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986).
- Wevers, J.W., and U. Quast (eds.), *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum*. Vol. II.2, *Leviticus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986).
- Zipor, M.A., 'The Greek Version of Leviticus', *Bib* 79 (1998), pp. 551–62.
- 'Notes sur les chapitres xix à xxii du Lévitique dans la Bible d'Alexandrie', *ETL* 67 (1991), pp. 328–37.

Numbers

T. V. Evans

Editions

(a) Standard Greek Editions

Göttingen, vol. III.1, *Numeri* (Wevers and Quast, 1982).

Cambridge, vol. I.3, *Numbers and Deuteronomy* (Brooke and McLean, 1911).

Rahlfs-Hanhart, vol. I, pp. 210–83.

Swete, vol. I, pp. 251–338.

(b) Modern Translations

NETS (Flint, 2007), pp. 107–40.

LXX.D (Rösel and Schlund, 2009), pp. 133–74.

Bd'A 4 (Dorival, 1994).

La Biblia Griega, vol. I (Fernández Marcos *et al.*, 2008), pp. 291–374.

I. General Characteristics

Numbers is, like the rest of the Greek Pentateuch, a more or less literal translation from a Hebrew *Vorlage* closely similar to, but not identical with, the received text of the MT. In language and style the five books of the Greek Pentateuch form a rough unit, and it is usually assumed that they were originally translated in Alexandria at much the same time in the third century B.C.E. (see § II below). Each book, however, manifests independent characteristics and seems undoubtedly to be the work of a separate translator (a view developed in the nineteenth century by Frankel and restated in the 1980s by Wevers, ‘Apologia’, pp. 20, 24, and ‘Göttingen Pentateuch’, pp. 57–60).

With regard to those independent characteristics, Numbers has acquired a somewhat mixed reputation. Its recent assessors tend to find in it both strengths and notable weaknesses. For Wevers it is ‘without a doubt by far the weakest volume in the Greek Pentateuch’, the work of ‘an intelligent translator, who knew what he was doing’, but who was also ‘guilty of grammatical infelicities, and of thoughtless errors of translation and even of stupid mistakes’ (*Notes Numbers*, pp. ix, xxvii, and xv). For Flint the work is ‘quite a literal reproduction of the Hebrew that is often wooden’; the translator is ‘at times careless or inaccurate, but he can also be skilful in carrying out his task, with successful attempts to achieve consistency and to harmonize passages’ (NETS, p. 107). Dines offers the more neutral observation that ‘This translator has a less varied style [than some of the other Pentateuchal translators] and is usually fairly literal (especially where syntax is concerned), though he too sometimes translates rather freely, especially with regard to lexical choices’ (Dines, *The Septuagint*, p. 15).

These comments demonstrate the difficulty of generalisation in description of Septuagint books. As a translation Numbers certainly has an uneven quality, and is frequently rather mechanical. Inaccuracies and confusions are a factor. The text is, however, rarely rendered difficult to understand. It also contains passages of great vigour and stylistic pretension (see § III).

II. Time and Place of Composition

We lack firm data on precisely where and when the Greek translation of Numbers was composed. It was probably in existence at latest by the mid-second century B.C.E. and predates the translation of Ecclesiasticus, made after 132 B.C.E. (Caird, ‘Ben Sira’; Dines, *The Septuagint*, p. 46). There are sound reasons for favouring the traditional notion that the whole of the Greek Pentateuch was produced somewhat earlier than this *terminus ante quem*, by the Jewish community in Alexandria during the reign of Ptolemy II Philadelphos (285–246 B.C.E.).

These are not so much the traditional arguments, which are based on the problematic influence of early reports preserved in the *Letter of Aristaeas* (which purports to be an eyewitness account, but is clearly a later, probably second-century B.C.E., production) and a fragment of the

Jewish philosopher Aristobulus (also probably second century B.C.E.) (Dines, *The Septuagint*, pp. 27–38; cf. Wright, ‘Transcribing’, pp. 160–61, on the dubious historicity of the *Letter*). Rather, they rest on as yet underexploited linguistic evidence. This will always be less accurate than we might wish, but various linguistic indicators are consistent with an early date. Most significant is lexical evidence isolated by John Lee, whose experiments with semantic fields exhibiting the obsolescence and replacement of vocabulary items represent the key breakthrough (Lee, *Lexical Study*, pp. 129–44; Evans, ‘Use’). Such features as the vitality of the optative mood in the Pentateuchal books (including notable examples in Numbers) point in the same direction (Evans, *Verbal Syntax*, pp. 175–80, 188–90, 263). One cannot rule out second-century composition, but the third is a more likely linguistic fit. In addition, the diversity of translation techniques found in the various books already composed by the time of Ben Sira’s grandson, the translator of Ecclesiasticus (Caird, ‘Ben Sira’, p. 100), seems best explained as resulting from a process extending over a considerable period of time.

The language of the Greek Pentateuch is also consistent with Alexandrian (or at least Egyptian) provenance, showing clear links with that of early Ptolemaic papyri and inscriptions. The relationship is powerfully demonstrated for the sphere of vocabulary in Lee’s *Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch* (findings summarised in Lee, *Lexical Study*, pp. 145–47). Once again, the linguistic evidence cannot provide definite proof of provenance, but is highly suggestive. Consider, by way of a single example, Num. 25.8 εἰς τὴν κάμινον (for MT אֵלֶּה־הַקִּבָּה). The Hebrew קִבָּה is a *hapax*, generally interpreted as referring to a kind of (vaulted) room (cf. *HALOT* s.v.; Wevers, *Notes Numbers*, p. xxxiv). The Greek word κάμινος is best known (through the influence of its seriously dated LSJ entry) in the sense ‘oven, kiln’ (LSJ offer ‘alcove’ for the Numbers instance). But it also turns up in the sense ‘room’ in a third-century B.C.E. papyrus from Egypt, which would seem to explain the Numbers translator’s choice of the word (see *PColZen* II 81.9, 14 and n. to l. 9; *pace* Wevers, *Notes Numbers*, p. xxxiv). We may well suspect a characteristically Egyptian sense-extension ‘(domed) oven’ > ‘(domed) room’, based probably on similarity of shape.

III. Language

The language of Numbers is essentially a ‘very natural’ example of early Koine Greek (Horrocks, *Greek*, p. 106, on the language of the Greek Pentateuch in general). We can clearly see this in its vocabulary and morphology. Many natural features can also be observed in the spheres of syntax and morphosyntax, where not obscured by the effects of translation technique (on which see § IV below). Consider the following extract (Num. 11.9-10):

καὶ ὅταν κατέβη ἡ δρόσος ἐπὶ τὴν παρεμβολὴν νυκτός, κατέβαινε τὸ μάννα ἐπ’ αὐτῆς. καὶ ἤκουσεν Μωυσῆς κλαιόντων αὐτῶν κατὰ δήμους αὐτῶν, ἕκαστον ἐπὶ τῆς θύρας αὐτοῦ· ἐθυμώθη ὀργῇ κύριος σφόδρα, καὶ ἔναντι Μωυσῆ ἦν πονηρόν.

And when the dew came down upon the camp by night, the manna was coming down upon it. And Moses heard them weeping according to their groupings, each one at his door. And the Lord became very angry with wrath, and before Moses it was evil. (trans. Evans)

The aspectual contrast between *κατέβη* and *κατέβαινε*—that is, between the aorist and imperfect indicative of the same verb—is a conspicuously natural feature, unmotivated by the underlying Hebrew text. So too are the use of the genitive expression *κλαιόντων αὐτῶν*, describing the persons heard, after *ἤκουσεν*, and the vague neuter of the expression *ἦν πονηρόν* (problematised at Wevers, *Notes Numbers*, p. xi; NETS, p. 108). This neuter refers to the situation as a whole, in a construction which has a long Greek pedigree (cf. the use of the neuter relative pronoun *ὃ* ‘as to which’ at Thucydides 2.40.3; also *ἃ* at Isocrates 9.122). Also interesting is the accusative *ἕκαστον*. Dorival suggests that it may agree with *δήμους*, while acknowledging that this would not seem to make sense (*Bd’A* 4, p. 289). It appears more probable that we have another natural feature here, reference back to *κλαιόντων αὐτῶν* and a failure of strict grammatical agreement involving shift from genitive to accusative. Case shifts like this reflect easy mental transfer (cf. the shifts between nominative and accusative in *PSI* VI 569.2–10, a third-century letter on papyrus written in standard Koine Greek).

Some passages of Numbers show great liveliness of language and style and independence from the underlying Hebrew. Note the following excerpt (Num. 22.27-29) from the Balaam story of Numbers 22-24:

καὶ ἰδοῦσα ἡ ὄνος τὸν ἄγγελον τοῦ θεοῦ συνεκάθισεν ὑποκάτω Βαλαάμ· καὶ ἐθυμώθη Βαλαάμ καὶ ἔτυπεν τὴν ὄνον τῇ ῥάβδῳ. καὶ ἤνοιξεν ὁ θεὸς τὸ στόμα τῆς ὄνου, καὶ λέγει τῷ Βαλαάμ, Τί πεποίηκά σοι ὅτι πέπαικάς με τοῦτο τρίτον; καὶ εἶπεν Βαλαάμ τῇ ὄνῳ, Ὅτι ἐμπέπαιχάς μοι· καὶ εἰ εἶχον μάχαιραν ἐν τῇ χειρὶ μου, ἤδη ἂν ἐξεκέντησά σε.

And the ass saw the angel of God and sat down under Balaam; and Balaam became angry and struck the ass with the staff. And God opened the mouth of the ass, and she says to Balaam, ‘What have I done to you that you have struck me this third time?’ And Balaam said to the ass, ‘It is because you have mocked me; and if I had a sword in my hand, I would already have stabbed you’. (trans. Evans)

Here we have another series of natural features manifesting a significant degree of independence from the demands of the Hebrew. Thus, the aorist participle ἰδοῦσα ‘seeing’ renders the consecutive imperfect אָרַתּוּ in 22.27 (cf. Evans, *Verbal Syntax*, pp. 130–31). The historic present λέγει ‘she says’ renders the consecutive imperfect אָמַרְתּוּ in 22.28 (for the historic present in the Greek Pentateuch, see Voitila, *Présent*, pp. 91–106; Evans, *Verbal Syntax*, pp. 119–20, 263; Evans, ‘Approaches’, pp. 32–33). The sequence of perfect indicatives πεποίηκα, πέπαικας, and ἐμπέπαιχας render Hebrew perfects in direct speech in 22.28-29 (on this match and the affinity of the perfect indicative with direct speech, see Evans, *Verbal Syntax*, pp. 123, 158–60). And the quite freely constructed mixed condition καὶ εἰ εἶχον μάχαιραν ἐν τῇ χειρὶ μου, ἤδη ἂν ἐξεκέντησά σε translates כִּי עָתָה הִרְגַתִּיךָ בְּיַדִּי יֵשׁ לְךָ שֶׁרָבַח בְּיָדִי in 22.29. These are all positive indicators of linguistic competence. Their concentration is also suggestive. The natural vigour of the translation in this passage may perhaps be linked to the engaging qualities of the subject matter, though the idea is essentially unprovable (Evans, *Verbal Syntax*, p. 216; cf. Aejmelaeus, *Parataxis*, p. 172).

There are also signs of stylistic pretension in the Balaam story. Note, for instance, the use of the comparative optative ἐκλείξαι in Num. 22.4 νῦν ἐκλείξει ἡ συναγωγὴ αὐτὴ πάντα τοὺς κύκλω, ὡς ἐκλείξει ὁ μὸσχος τὰ χλωρὰ ἐκ τοῦ πεδίου, ‘now this band will lick up all those round us, as

the young bull might lick up the grass from the plain' (on the comparative optative see Evans, *Verbal Syntax*, pp. 190–97). We also meet interplay between the simplex ἀρῶμαι and its compounds καταρῶμαι and ἐπικαταρῶμαι at Num. 22.6, 11; 23.7, 8, a feature of positive stylistic value from the classical period onward (cf. Evans, *Verbal Syntax*, pp. 195–96 n. 92; Thackeray, *Grammar*, p. 260).

Biblical scholars have seen many features of the Greek of Numbers (and of the Greek Pentateuch more generally) as grammatically odd or somehow unsatisfactory. The language of these texts contains numerous features which are distinct from the 'rules' of classical literature, but which are in fact fairly straightforward examples of the Greek of their time. For instance, the plural verb used with singular subject in Num. 4.42 ἐπεσκέπησαν δὲ καὶ δῆμος υἱῶν Μεραρὶ, is simply a *constructio ad sensum*. The verbal form of 4.38 καὶ ἐπεσκέπησαν υἱοὶ Γεδσῶν κατὰ δῆμους αὐτῶν may perhaps be influential, but a translation-technical motivation does not need to be sought (cf. Wevers, *Notes Numbers*, p. xi). More surprising perhaps is Num. 22.5 καὶ ἀπέστειλεν πρέσβεις πρὸς Βαλαάμ υἱὸν Βεῶρ Φαθούρα, ὃ ἐστὶν ἐπὶ τοῦ ποταμοῦ, 'and he sent envoys to Balaam son of Beor of Phathoura, which is on the river'. The names of cities are usually feminine, so the neuter relative pronoun ὃ may seem strange (Wevers, *Notes Numbers*, p. xii; Flint, NETS, p. 108). Names of cities, however, may also be neuter (e.g., Μέγαρα, Πέργαμον, and in Egypt Πηλούσιον), and the translator may even have thought of Φαθούρα in terms of a word like χωρίον 'place, district'. Once again, the feature questioned does not need necessarily to be seen as a mistake.

IV. Translation and Composition

In highlighting the natural Greek features of Numbers one must not deny its manifest peculiarities of composition in relation to the language of extra-biblical texts from the same period. It is a typical sample of early translation Greek. The literal tendencies of the translator's method result in distinctive patterns of composition, most notably in the markedly Hebraistic word order. Regular lexical equivalents, such as προσκυνῶ for הִשְׁתַּחוּת and παραβολή for לְשֹׁמֵר, are a feature as well, while we also find Hebraistic syntactic structures, such as 22.15 καὶ προσέθετο ἔτι + inf.

‘and he added further (to)’ rendering עוֹד וַיִּסַּף + inf. and 11.29 καὶ τίς δώσει
‘and who would give’ rendering וּמִי יִתֵּן (cf. Wevers, *Notes Numbers*,
pp. xviii–xix; Wevers, *Text Hist. Numbers*, p. 94; Flint, *NETS*, p. 108).
We also need to note occasional confusions arising from the process of
translation. Voitila has, for instance, identified important examples at
Num. 9.16–23 and 10.11–25, where contextually inappropriate choices of
Greek verbal forms are clearly influenced by the underlying Hebrew
verbal forms (Voitila, ‘What the Translation’, pp. 186, 188, 193–94, and
‘The Translator’, pp. 111–13; whether these reflect a ‘short-segment’
style of translation or simple aberrations is less clear-cut, cf. Evans,
‘Alleged Confusions’).

Yet recent commentators have rightly observed a tension between
literal tendencies and ‘free’ qualities in the translation of Numbers (see
§ I above). The repetitive content of parts of the Hebrew text is highly
conducive to the ‘often wooden’ style of translation noted by Flint, but
the translator ‘did not mindlessly translate word for word in dull, plod-
ding fashion’ (Wever, *Notes Numbers*, p. xxvii; cf. Wevers, *Text Hist.*
Numbers, pp. 102–103). Some independent features occur even within
constructions heavily influenced by the underlying Hebrew, such as the
enigmatic optative in Num. 11.29 καὶ τίς δώσει (Evans, ‘Approaches’,
pp. 25, 26, 29–32).

The distinctive features of the Numbers translation (at least as recon-
structured in the Göttingen edition) are a taste for consistency and
harmonisation and a tendency toward clarification and elaboration,
involving sometimes major differences from the MT in arrangement or
structure of specific passages. The preference for consistency manifests
itself notably in careful application of formulaic patterns, either on a
large scale as in the description of the census of the Israelite tribes from
Numbers 1 and of the stations of the desert journey from Numbers 33,
or in smaller structural details. The translation’s harmonising practice
involves levelling the text or rationalising perceived inconsistencies in
the MT. Wevers has provided an extensive catalogue of relevant features,
Flint a useful summary (Wevers, *Notes Numbers*, pp. xv–xxvi; *NETS*,
pp. 108–109).

V. Key Text-Critical Issues

Numbers does not present the complex textual difficulties of some Septuagint books. On the other hand, the manuscripts are generally eclectic, replete with recensional elements. This applies even to one of the earliest witnesses, 4QLXXNum from the end of the first century B.C.E. (Ulrich, 'Septuagint Manuscripts'; *Bd'A* 4, pp. 37–39). Wevers provides a detailed discussion of the different text groups and families and of the principles for reconstruction of his critical text for the Göttingen edition (Wevers, *Text Hist. Numbers*). The minor pluses, minuses and harmonisations of the LXX point to a Hebrew *Vorlage* that differs slightly from the MT. At times it accords with the Samaritan Pentateuch and at times with the Peshitta, but also preserves its own proto-Masoretic readings (*Bd'A*, pp. 45–47).

VI. Ideology and Exegesis

Translation is always a form of commentary. The beliefs and theology of the translator of Numbers emerge in various indicative details. Wevers has elucidated a series of these (Wevers, *Notes Numbers*, esp. pp. xxviii–xxxiv). A striking example is a tendency (as in Deuteronomy) to avoid the idea of a human king for Israel (*Notes Numbers*, p. xxviii); for example, τὰ ἔνδοξα ἀρχόντων ἐν αὐτοῖς 'the glorious deeds of chieftains are in it' for MT ותרועת מלך בו 'and the acclaim of a king is in it (i.e. Israel)' at 23.21. Another is prejudice against the non-Israelite prophet Balaam, marked by, among other things, the characteristic use of ὁ θεός instead of κύριος as a translation of יהוה (*Notes Numbers*, p. xxix). The translator's interpretative modification of the Hebrew text can also be isolated in resolution of perceived contradictions or inaccuracies, for instance the regularisation of the age at which Levites were to begin tabernacle service in 4.3 and 8.24 (*Notes Numbers*, pp. xxiv–xxv). And there are clear attempts to simplify or clarify passages, as in the choice of the expression ἕως καθαρίσθη Μαριάμ 'until Miriam was made clean' rendering עד האסף מרים 'until Miriam was readmitted' at 12.15. A quite different idea is conveyed by the Greek verb, which explains the reason for Miriam's absence (*Notes Numbers*, p. xxi).

VII. Reception History

Aspects of the reception history of Numbers have been traced by Dorival in the relevant *La Bible d'Alexandrie* volume (*Bd'A* 4). This book is a relatively unproductive source for Christian writers. There is only one direct quotation in the New Testament (Num. 16.5 at 2 Tim. 2.19), and citations are fairly rare in Patristic authors (Swete, *Intro.*, pp. 406–32). One of the major early commentaries on Numbers was that by Origen, preserved in Rufinus' Latin translation. His twenty-seventh homily on Numbers is typical of his interpretative style, taking the forty-two stages in the wilderness journey as forty-two stages in the spiritual life (Lienhard, *Ancient*, p. xxi). He bases this on the supposed Hebrew etymologies of the names, although he is drawing on the Greek text.

Bibliography

- Aejmelaeus, A., *Parataxis in the Septuagint: A Study of the Renderings of the Hebrew Coordinate Clauses in the Greek Pentateuch* (Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedekatemia, 1982).
- Caird, G.B., 'Ben Sira and the Dating of the Septuagint', in E. Livingstone (ed.), *Studia Evangelica*. Vol. VII, *Papers Presented to the Fifth International Congress on Biblical Studies Held at Oxford, 1973* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1982), pp. 95–100.
- Dines, J.M., *The Septuagint* (London: T&T Clark International, 2004).
- Dorival, G. et al. (eds.), *La Bible d'Alexandrie*. Vol. IV, *Les Nombres* (Paris: Cerf, 1994).
- Evans, T.V., 'Approaches to the Language of the Septuagint', *JJS* 56 (2005), pp. 25–33.
- 'Some Alleged Confusions in Translation from Hebrew to Greek', *Bib* 83 (2002), pp. 238–48.
- 'The Use of Linguistic Criteria for Dating Septuagint Books', *BIOSCS* 43 (2010), pp. 7–24.
- Verbal Syntax in the Greek Pentateuch: Natural Greek Usage and Hebrew Interference* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).
- Flint, P.W., 'Numbers', in A. Pietersma and B.G. Wright (eds.), *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), pp. 107–40.
- Horrocks, G.C., *Greek: A History of the Language and its Speakers* (2nd ed.; Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010).
- Lienhard, J.T., *Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy* (Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture: Old Testament 3; Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2001).
- Lee, J.A.L., *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch* (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983).

- Ulrich, E.C., 'The Septuagint Manuscripts from Qumran: A Reappraisal of Their Value', in G.J. Brooke and B. Lindars (eds.), *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings: Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint (Manchester 1990)* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), pp. 49–80.
- Voitila, A., *Présent et imparfait de l'indicatif dans le Pentateuque grec: Une étude sur la syntaxe de traduction* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2001).
- 'The Translator of the Greek Numbers', in B.A. Taylor (ed.), *IX Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Cambridge 1995* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), pp. 109–21.
- 'What the Translation of Tenses Tells about the Septuagint Translators', *SJOT* 10 (1996), pp. 183–96.
- Wevers, J.W., and U. Quast (eds.), *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum. Vol. III.1, Numeri* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982).
- Wevers, J.W., 'An Apologia for Septuagint Studies', *BIOSCS* 18 (1985), pp. 16–38.
- 'The Göttingen Pentateuch: Some Post-partem Reflections', in C.E. Cox (ed.), *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Leuven, 1989* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991), pp. 51–60.
- Text History of the Greek Numbers* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982).
- Wright, B.G., 'Transcribing, Translating, and Interpreting in the Letter of Aristeas: On the Nature of the Septuagint', in A. Voitila and J. Jokiranta (eds.), *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls* (Festschrift R. Sollamo; Leiden: Brill, 2008), pp. 147–61.

Deuteronomy

Larry Perkins

Editions

(a) Standard Greek Editions

Göttingen, vol. III.2, *Deuteronomium* (Wevers and Quast, 1977).

Cambridge, vol. I.3, *Numbers and Deuteronomy* (Brooke and McLean, 1911).

Rahlfs-Hanhart, vol. I, pp. 284–353.

Swete, vol. I, pp. 339–419.

(b) Modern Translations

NETS (Peters, 2007), pp. 141–73.

LXX.D (Hertog *et al.*, 2009), pp. 175–215.

Bd'A 5 (Dogniez and Harl, 1992).

La Biblia Griega, vol. I (Fernández Marcos *et al.*, 2008), pp. 375–448.

I. General Characteristics

As the fifth book in the Pentateuch, Greek Deuteronomy forms part of the earliest portion of the Jewish sacred writings translated into Greek. Accordingly, the translation has received considerable scholarly attention in the modern era, beginning with Z. Frankel's 1831 discussion (*Einfluss*, pp. 201–27), and particularly since the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls (White, 'Critical Edition'; Duncan, 'Critical Edition'; DJD 14), the preparation of the Göttingen edition of the Greek text by John Wevers (1977), the publication of the translation and notes in *Bd'A* (1992), Wevers's *Text History* (1978) and *Notes* (1995), and introductions and translations into modern languages, including English (NETS), German (LXX.D) and Spanish (*La Biblia griega*). The study of LXX Deuteronomy has also benefitted from scholarly investigations of the Greek Pentateuch

as a whole (Wittstruck, ‘Greek Translators’; Wevers, ‘Attitude’). Specifically lexical (Lee, *Lexical Study*) and grammatical studies (Aejmelaeus, *Parataxis; On the Trail*) seek to understand the translation technique employed by the various individuals involved in this ancient project.

The Hebrew text of Deuteronomy determines the content of the corresponding Greek text. The entire book forms a series of addresses by Moses, the leader of Israel, to the people and leaders of Israel in sacred convocation as they are on the verge of entering Palestine. Some narrative portions occur in 1.1-5 and the final chapter (34), and occasionally God speaks directly to Moses (31.1-30; 32.48-52), but primarily Moses narrates God’s rescue of and covenant promises with Israel. The poetic material in chs. 31–33 forms a particularly interesting section in both the Hebrew and Greek texts.

The title Δευτερονόμιον used in the Septuagint tradition arose from the occurrence of this word in Deut. 17.18. Moses gave instructions for a future ruler’s conduct:

καὶ ἔσται ὅταν καθίσῃ ἐπὶ τοῦ δίφρου τῆς ἀρχῆς αὐτοῦ, καὶ γράψῃ ἐαυτῷ τὸ δευτερονόμιον τοῦτο εἰς βιβλίον παρὰ τῶν ἱερέων τῶν Λευιτῶν.

And it shall be, when he has sat upon the seat of his rule, that he shall write for himself this second law in a book from the priests, the Levites. (NETS)

The expression τὸ δευτερονόμιον τοῦτο glosses the Hebrew אַתְּ מִשְׁנֵה תוֹרַת הַזֹּאת (‘a copy of this law’, NRSV). The Hebrew term מִשְׁנֵה can mean either ‘second’ or ‘copy’, and the translator defines the king’s action as writing ‘a second law’ and combines the sense of the two bound Hebrew nouns into a single, compound Greek noun, which he may well have created. It is a neologism not found in earlier Greek literature. The translator or subsequent tradition¹ has used this term then to describe the fifth book of the Pentateuch and regards it as a ‘second law’, not merely a repetition of the first law which Yahweh revealed in Exodus through Numbers.² The translator clearly saw this ‘covenant in

1. Aristobulus (as quoted in Eusebius of Caesarea, *Preparatio Evangelium* 13.12.1-2) seems to describe Deuteronomy as τῆς ὅλης νομοθεσίας ἐπεξήγησις (‘a detailed account [or explanation] of the entire legislation’).

2. In Josh. 9.2c (8.32 MT) the Greek translation reads τὸ δευτερονόμιον, νόμον Μωσῆ as the rendering of אַתְּ מִשְׁנֵה תוֹרַת מֹשֶׁה. This seems to be a reference to Deuteronomy, identifying it as the ‘law of Moses’, which Israel is to obey. Josiah’s

the land of Moab' as distinct from the 'covenant made in Choreb' (28.69 [29.1]). Philo identifies this part of the Pentateuch by the title Δευτερονόμιον and his writings are the first direct witness to the use of this term as the title for this book (*Leg. All.* III.174; *Deus.* 50), although he also uses other terms (ἐπινόμις 'appendix', *Her.* 162, 250). Josephus, providing a summary of Deuteronomy in *Antiquities* 4, did not use a specific title, but identified it as 'these laws and this constitution' (τοὺς νόμους καὶ τὴν διάταξιν τῆς πολιτείας, 4.194) which Moses gave to Israel. While summarising Deut. 17.14-20, Josephus did not mention the responsibility of the Jewish king to write out a copy of the law (*Ant.* 4.223-24).

II. Time and Place of Composition

Although it is clear from studies of translation technique that the translator was different from the individuals who translated the other books of the Pentateuch, Greek Deuteronomy was completed in the same chronological and geographical context as the other four books of the Torah. The discovery of P^Rylands Gk. 458 (Göttingen 957) and its dating to the middle of the second century B.C.E. (ca. 150; Roberts, *Two Biblical Papyri*) establishes a chronological point after which the translation could not have been completed. Ulrich has published some fragments of Greek Deuteronomy (4QLXXDeut) identified as 11.4. The dating is uncertain, but it does indicate that Jews in Palestine had knowledge of this translation in the pre-Christian era (Ulrich, 'Greek Manuscripts'). Both of these discoveries, along with PFouad, Inv. 266 (Göttingen 848), which is dated to the middle of the first century B.C.E., indicate the origin of Greek Deuteronomy in the second or third century B.C.E. This would support the statement by the grandson of Sirach in his prologue that when he completed the translation of Ecclesiasticus, already the Greek Pentateuch existed (thirty-eighth year of the reign of Euergetes, ca. 132–116 B.C.E.). Further, Wisdom of Solomon knew and used Greek Deuteronomy (Wis. 6.7 and Deut. 1.17; Wis. 11.4 and Deut. 8.15; see Winston, *Wisdom*, pp. 153, 227). Similarly, 2 Maccabees seems to be

recovery of the book of the law is also identified by some as a form of Deuteronomy (4 Kgdms 22.8-23; 2 Chron. 34.14-35). It may also be the book of Moses that is mentioned in 2 Esd. 23.1 (= Neh. 13.1).

dependent upon LXX Deut. 31.21 and 32.36 (Goldstein, *II Maccabees*, p. 304). While the dating of both Wisdom of Solomon and 2 Maccabees is debated, most would place them in the mid-first century B.C.E.

All of these data demonstrate that Greek Deuteronomy was in use by the middle or end of the second century B.C.E. within Jewish communities in Palestine and Egypt. Tradition places the origin of the Greek Pentateuch during the reign of Ptolemy II Philadelphus, ca. 280 B.C.E. The *Letter of Aristeas* provides the strongest evidence in support of this timeframe (see Collins, *Library*, pp. 6–57). Confirmation of this chronology is provided by Wevers’s observation that syntactical usage such as the occurrence of *ἄν* in relative clauses conforms to the usage discerned in papyri from that era (*Text Hist. Deuteronomy*, pp. 99–102). Lee also provides supportive evidence from his lexical investigations that the Pentateuch was translated before 150 B.C.E. (*Lexical Study*, pp. 129–44). The same body of evidence points with considerable probability to Alexandria, Egypt, as the location for this translation work.

III. Language

The translator used Koine Greek as his medium, but often sacrificed Greek grammar, syntax and semantics in the service of his Hebrew text. Aejmelaeus, in her study of parataxis in the Greek Pentateuch, locates Deuteronomy on the more literal side of the translation spectrum. For example, the particle *δέ* occurs as the translation of the Hebrew conjunction *ו* ‘less than 3% of the cases in Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy’, but ‘in 25% of the cases in Genesis and 16% in Exodus’ (‘Significance’, p. 57). She also discerns a preference to represent *כי* by a causal *ὅτι* rather than *γάρ* (26% of the time), in contrast to Greek Exodus which used *γάρ* 85% of the time (*Parataxis*, pp. 145–47). A similar conclusion is reached for the rendering of apodictic *ו*. The translator reflects a ‘system of translating word for word’, rendering this specific Hebrew construction as *καί* 42% of the time, in comparison to Greek Exodus which has this equivalence in only 10% of the possible cases (*Parataxis*, pp. 145–57). These translation choices indicate that less attention is being paid to matters of Greek style and syntax by the translator of Deuteronomy. Dogniez and Harl also come to the same conclusion. Whether it is word order, articulation, reflection of the

distinction between singular and plural forms of the second person pronoun or consistent rendering of Hebrew prepositions by the same Greek preposition (כּ by ἐν; ל by εἰς), Greek Deuteronomy demonstrates a significant degree of literalism (*Bd'A* 5, pp. 29–33). Other indicators would be the tendency for relative pronouns to be attracted to the case of their antecedents (Wevers, *Notes Deuteronomy*, p. x) and the frequent representation of the pleonastic Hebrew pronoun אשר (represented in 61 cases in Deuteronomy, with 14 omissions; Soisalon-Soininen, 'Rendering', p. 61).

Given the tendency of this translator to a more literal method of translation, it is no surprise to discover that the repetitive Hebrew style influences the Greek text. Walters notes one peculiarity of Greek syntax in Deut. 28.7-36 (Walters, *Text*, pp. 237–41). In the Septuagint the optative, imperative and future indicative 'were used indiscriminately and freely interchanged, all three equally expressing a benediction or curse' (*Text*, p. 237). A remarkable pattern is seen in Deut. 28.7-36. When God is the subject of the Hebrew jussive, the Greek used the aorist optative, but when people are the subject, the future indicative is used. The result is that when God is the subject, these clauses become wishes and their effects upon human beings are expressed as potential future events, either blessing or curse. This feature indicates that the translator, while attending closely to his Hebrew text, found creative ways from time to time to express specific interpretations.

Another example would be the translator's avoidance of βασιλεύς in favour of ἄρχων when the text discusses an Israelite king. He used βασιλεύς in reference to kings of other nations (e.g., Sihon, 2.24; Og, 3.1; Pharaoh, 7.8), but when the Hebrew noun מֶלֶךְ refers to a future Israelite king, the translator used ἄρχων (17.14, 15 *bis*; 28.36; 33.5). In Wevers's opinion the 'LXX is intentionally avoiding the use of βασιλεύς, since to the translator only God can be Israel's king, and hence the מֶלֶךְ becomes merely "a ruler"' (Wevers, *Notes Deuteronomy*, p. 286).

IV. Translation and Composition

The translator's work is characterised by careful attention to his Hebrew text. He tends to retain Hebrew word order and the resultant translation generally displays isomorphism. The translation has a rather literal

character, with the Hebrew text shaping the form of the translation more than is the case with Greek Genesis or Exodus. The repetitive nature of the Hebrew text lends itself to a more literal approach. Wevers identifies 56 formulaic expressions, although he acknowledges that ‘the lists could undoubtedly be increased’ (*Text Hist. Deuteronomy*, pp. 86–99). The Hebrew texts of Deuteronomy discovered among the Dead Sea Scrolls, as well as the Samaritan textual tradition, show some textual variation as these formulae occur. The Greek translation reflects similar textual variation, and it is difficult to know when variation is due to the translator’s initiative and when it may reflect a difference between his Hebrew *Vorlage* and the MT (Wevers, ‘Attitude’, p. 501). There are no major additions or omissions in the Greek translation (apart from individual words, phrases and some clause structures), nor is there significant divergence in textual order from that found in the MT. After careful comparison of the readings in 848 and B (Vaticanus), Wevers concludes that the translator ‘was determined that his translation would reflect his parent text closely’ (‘Attitude’, p. 505).

Occasionally the translator seems to reveal his knowledge of other portions of the Greek Pentateuch. For example, in his account of the golden calf episode (9.12) his wording parallels that of Greek Exod. 32.7-8. Wevers concludes that ‘the Deut translator was acquainted with the Exod LXX seems almost certain’ (*Text Hist. Deuteronomy*, pp. 163–64). Or in the context of the repetition of the Ten Commandments the translator seems to take pains to follow the wording used by the Exodus translator. For example, the Greek translation of Deut. 5.10 seems to reflect awareness of Exod. 20.6 because this is the only context in Greek Deuteronomy where *προστάγματα* renders מצוות, but this is also what Greek Exodus reads. In most contexts in Deuteronomy *ἐντολή* is the equivalent of this Hebrew noun (39 times).

V. Key Text-Critical Issues

The work on the textual tradition of Greek Deuteronomy by Wevers has set the standard, particularly as expressed in the 1977 Göttingen edition. Of particular interest for the reconstruction of the text, as near to the original as possible, is the recovery of pre-Christian Jewish materials (Wevers, *Text Hist. Deuteronomy*, pp. 48–51). As Wevers notes:

the discovery of P.Fouad, Inv. 266, of which 848 is the major part, marks one of the most important discoveries of Septuagint texts in this [twentieth] century. 848 is a ms dating from the middle of the first century B.C. and contains substantial amounts of text from the second half of Deuteronomy (from 17₁₄ to 33₂₉) (*Text Hist. Deuteronomy*, p. 64).

If this dating is correct, then this copy was produced about 200 years after the translation itself was produced. Wevers regards it as more reliable in many instances as a textual witness than Codex Vaticanus. It provides an interesting perspective on the degree of alteration that has affected the Greek text of Deuteronomy in the centuries between 848 and the creation of Vaticanus. One peculiarity is its characteristic spelling of Moses's name as $\mu\omega\sigma\eta\varsigma$ in contrast to $M\omega\upsilon\sigma\eta\varsigma$, which is undoubtedly the original transcription (how otherwise to explain the unusual $\omega\upsilon$ combination). Perhaps, as Wevers speculates, the scribe of 848 knew the Hebrew form and adopted a transcription that reflected this more exactly. From other evidence it is clear that revision of the Greek text towards existing Hebrew textual forms was occurring in the pre-Christian context and this treatment of Moses' name may be additional support for this phenomenon. In 1936 Roberts published a smaller papyrus fragment (John Rylands Libr., P.Gr. 458), numbered 957 in the Göttingen edition and dated to the second century B.C.E. It contains about 100 verses from Deuteronomy 23–28. It should also be noted that Ulrich has published a small fragment of Greek Deuteronomy discovered at Qumran (4QLXXDt; fragments of Deut. 11.4). While the dating is uncertain, it is pre-Christian. Although fragmentary, the text does seem to cohere with Wevers's edited text for this same verse (Ulrich, 'Greek Manuscripts', pp. 71–82). The second-century C.E. PChester Beatty VI (963 Göttingen) provides another significant witness to the pre-Hexaplaric form of the Greek text of Deuteronomy.

These early, pre-Hexaplaric texts indicate that in the case of Greek Deuteronomy the general lines of Lagarde's theory of Septuagint origins is the most probable explanation: one original translation has shaped the subsequent textual tradition, and most variations are due to copyist error, revision and subsequent recensional activity.

VI. Ideology and Exegesis

Dogniez and Harl have reviewed various elements in the Greek text that define the translator's perspective (*Bd'A* 5). They draw attention to the use of the terminology *αὕτη ἡ σοφία ὑμῶν καὶ ἡ σύνεσις ἐναντίον πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν* in Deut. 4.1-10 to describe the prescriptions given to Israel in the law, something that distinguishes Israel from 'all [an addition by the translator?] the nations' (cf. Sir. 24.6-8; *Bd'A* 5, pp. 47-48; the Greek terminology reflects that found in the MT). They also note that the translator has varied his translation of דברים/דבר 'word(s)' between *ῥῆμα/ῥήματα* and *λόγος/λόγοι* (*Bd'A* 5, p. 43), the latter seen as less religious in sense. However, how significant this variation is with respect to meaning is debated, and the variations in 10.2-4 might suggest greater synonymity.

The translator does incorporate lexical terms not found in earlier Greek literature, mostly built on standard Greek formations. One of the more noteworthy of these is the noun *γραμματοεισαγωγεὺς*, which renders שרש (see 1.15; 16.18; 29.9[10]; 31.28). The Hebrew noun in the plural also occurs in Deut. 20.5, 8, 9, but the Greek equivalent employed is *γραμματεῖς* 'scribes'. As Peters suggests, the formation combines 'two known Greek functionaries: a *γραμματεὺς* 'scribe' and an *εισαγωγεὺς* 'one who brings cases to court' into *γραμματοεισαγωγεὺς* 'one who records things for judges' (NETS, p. 143). Caird suggests that 'the monstrous compound' could define an official who was '(a) a scribe-magistrate; (b) a magistrate in charge of records; (c) a magistrate to deal with legal documents'. He opts for 'recorder' as 'the nearest English equivalent' ('Towards a Lexicon', p. 122). Another neologism is the noun *διασπορά* (28.25; 30.4), a normal Greek nominal formation from the verb *διασπείρω*, itself used four times (4.27; 28.64; 32.8, 26). In 28.25 the MT records Moses' warning that if Israel sins, they will become 'an object of horror to all the kingdoms of the earth' (NRSV). The translator renders 'object of horror' by the phrase *ἐν διασπορᾷ*, suggesting that 'dispersion' is a divine punishment. In 30.4 the scope of the *διασπορά* extends 'from an end of the sky to an end of the sky' (NETS; MT: 'at the edge of the sky'). The translator seems to have particular interest in the matter of the Jewish diaspora, something we might expect within the Alexandrian Jewish community.

Another intriguing text is Deut. 18.10-11, where Moses forbids Israel from engaging in certain practices. Nine Greek present participles are used to reflect diverse Hebrew terms. It is difficult to discern the specific meaning of some of these Hebrew and Greek terms. In the first instance, the translator used *περικαθαίρων*, another neologism, to refer to a process of purifying *ἐν πυρί* sons or daughters, presumably a means of gaining direction from the deity. Perhaps the translator avoids the idea of sacrificing children to pagan deities as expressed in the Hebrew text. The participle *κληδονιζόμενος* ‘being a diviner’, another neologism, is related to the noun *κληδῶν* ‘sign or omen’. The corresponding Hebrew term describes a ‘soothsayer’. Another rare term in this context is *ἐγγαστρίμυθος*, which seems to have the sense of an ‘oracular ventriloquist’ (also in Lev. 19.31; 20.6, 27 for the same Hebrew term). The translator understands the context, but does not seem to know the exact meaning of each Hebrew term and chooses words that describe contemporary divinatory processes.

A final example of neologisms relates to terms that describe Israel’s ‘hardness of heart’ (spiritual stubbornness). It is the translator, it seems, who coined the term *σκληροκαρδία* (10.16) and used it alongside such lexemes as *σκληρότης* (9.27); *σκληροτράχηλος* (9.6, 13); and *σκληρύνειν* (10.16). These cognate terms render forms of the Hebrew root *קשה* ‘hard’. The noun *σκληροκαρδία*, however, occurs in a clause rendering the bound phrase *ערוֹת לבבכם* ‘the foreskin of your heart’. The translator makes the metaphor explicit. He follows a similar strategy at 30.6 where he used another neologism *περικαθαρίζω* ‘purge entirely’ to define the Lord’s intent ‘to circumcise your heart’. The Greek verb means to purify, cleanse, purge in a thorough manner. The usual translation of the Hebrew verb *מול* is *περιτέμνειν* ‘to circumcise’. Why the translator avoids this metaphor is a matter of speculation. However, it demonstrates the creativity of the translator when he considers it necessary to interpret his Hebrew text. Whether the translator is incorporating his own emphases or is reflecting a more widely held Jewish perspective cannot be determined.

One of the primary segments in the Deuteronomy narrative is the iteration of the Ten Commandments. There is significant similarity between the Greek translations of Exodus 20 and Deuteronomy 5

because the Hebrew texts are also closely configured (see Wevers, *Text Hist. Deuteronomy*, pp. 98–105). However, Greek Deuteronomy does show some independence, even though aware of the Exodus translation. For example, in 5.6 it rendered the Hebrew clause with an articulated participle (ὁ ἐξάγαγόν σε) in contrast with Greek Exodus which used a relative clause (ὅστις ἐξήγαγόν σε), representing the formal MT Hebrew syntax more closely. The opposite tendency occurs in Deut. 5.14, which reads καὶ ὁ προσήλυτος ὁ ἐντὸς τῶν πυλῶν σου, a literal translation of the Hebrew, whereas Exod. 20.10 used καὶ ὁ προσήλυτος ὁ παροικῶν ἐν σοί. Both texts, however, interpret the prohibition against worshipping other gods in the same way: ὅτι ἐγώ/ἐγὼ γάρ εἰμι κύριος ὁ θεὸς σου, θεὸς ζηλωτῆς ἀποδιδοῦς ἀμαρτίας (Deut. 5.9/Exod. 20.5). Apart from the variation between ὅτι and γάρ, reflecting the default choices of each translator, the rendering is the same, both reflecting the same interpretation of the Hebrew text. According to the Greek translators it is wrong to worship other gods ‘Because I am the Lord your God’, not, as the Hebrew text emphasises, because the Lord is a jealous God. The Greek translations alter the predicate nominative structure (Wevers, *Text Hist. Deuteronomy*, pp. 100–101).

The order of commands six through eight also varies.

<i>Masoretic Text Order in Exodus and Deuteronomy</i>	<i>Greek Exodus Order</i>	<i>Greek Deuteronomy Order</i>
6 You shall not murder	7 οὐ μοιχεύσεις	7 οὐ μοιχεύσεις
7 You shall not commit adultery	8 οὐ κλέψεις	6 οὐ φονεύσεις
8 You shall not steal	6 οὐ φονεύσεις	8 οὐ κλέψεις

These different orderings raise significant questions. Given the faithfulness of Greek Deuteronomy to his Hebrew *Vorlage*, the presumption is that the order of these commands reflects his Hebrew text, and therefore the order was not set firmly at the beginning of the third century B.C.E. There is no apparent reason for an arbitrary change in order by the Deuteronomy or Exodus translators.

Deuteronomy incorporates several creed-like statements, notably the Shema (6.4-9) with its instructions, and the declaration made by an Israelite when offering the first-fruits (26.5-10a). In both cases the

translation expands the text (at least in comparison to MT). At 6.4 the Greek text has a lengthy introductory clause preceding the Shema which is absent from the MT:

καὶ ταῦτα τὰ δικαιώματα καὶ τὰ κρίματα, ὅσα ἐνετείλατο κύριος τοῖς υἱοῖς
Ἰσραὴλ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἐξεληθόντων αὐτῶν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου...

And these are the statutes and the judgments which the Lord commanded to the sons of Israel in the wilderness as they were coming out from the land of Egypt. (NETS)

Whether or not the translator had this in his Hebrew text, the phrasing is very similar to material that occurs elsewhere (cf. 4.45). In the Shema itself, the translator adds the verb *ἐστίν* for clarification:

ἄκουε, Ἰσραὴλ· κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν κύριος εἷς ἐστίν

Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God the Lord is one. (trans. *Notes Deuteronomy*, p. 114)

Moses then instructed Israel to tie these commands as a sign, rendered in Greek as ‘and you shall bind them as a sign (*εἰς σημεῖον*) on your hand and they shall be things unshakeable (or “fixtures”) (*ἀσάλευτα*) before your eyes’ (6.8b NETS). The translator did not seem to understand *תפוח*, usually understood as ‘frontlets, phylacteries’, and instead interpreted that the commandments would stay ‘immovably’ in their sight (*ἀσάλευτα* also used at Deut. 11.18 and Exod. 13.16).

The statement in 26.5b-10a is a thanksgiving, acknowledging how God has kept his promise and ‘given us this land, a land flowing with milk and honey’ (26.9b NRSV). In the initial section the translator appears to struggle with the unusual Hebrew formation. The Hebrew phrase ‘a wandering/lost Aramean’ or ‘an ailing/perishing Aramean’ (v. 5) was rendered as *Συρίαν ἀπέβαλεν ὁ πατήρ μου*, meaning either ‘my father rejected/cast off Syria’ or ‘my father abandoned Syria’. The reference then would be to Jacob’s return from Syria to Canaan. The Greek text then proceeds to describe how the Israelites ‘sojourned’ (*παρώκησεν*), living as temporary residents in Egypt and growing from a small group to a most numerous nation. When Deuteronomy described the exodus in v. 8, the translator includes *αὐτὸς ἐν ἰσχύι μεγάλη καὶ* ‘even he by great strength and’ at the beginning of the long list of God’s actions, emphasising God’s personal engagement in Israel’s deliverance (unless the

phrase was in his Hebrew *Vorlage*). One further difference is in the rendering *καὶ ἐν ὀράμασιν μεγάλοις* ‘and with great spectacles’, apparently reading the Hebrew root *רא* for *ראה* (‘with a terrifying display of power’, NRSV).

These examples demonstrate some of the ways that the translator of Deuteronomy put his stamp upon the material and ensures that his understanding of the Hebrew text, or the understanding of his Jewish community, finds expression. A literal translation tendency does not exclude the ability to embed specific interpretations.

As Deuteronomy concludes, ch. 32 incorporates a ‘song’ composed by Moses. Its purpose is to bear witness to his warning that the *ἑκκλησία Ἰσραήλ* would prove faithless to the covenant (31.21, 30). According to the Greek, this song forms the conclusion to *πάντας τοὺς λόγους τοῦ νόμου τούτου* (‘all the words of this law’, 32.44) that Moses spoke to Israel, explicitly identifying Moses’s words, including this song, as comprising ‘the law’ (something not in the MT).

In the song the Lord is described metaphorically as *הצור* ‘the rock’ many times, yet in each case the translator translates it as *θεός* (32.4, 15, 18, 30, 31 or omits it as in 37—Olofsson, *God is My Rock*, pp. 38–40). In v. 31 the translator renders his Hebrew text as *ὅτι οὐκ ὡς ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν οἱ θεοὶ αὐτῶν* (‘For not like our God are their gods’, NETS), but the Masoretic text has *צור* twice, singular in both cases: ‘indeed their rock is not like our Rock’ (NRSV). This translator expresses sensitivity towards describing God as *πέτρα* (cf. Olofsson, *God is My Rock*, pp. 35–36).

The final verse (32.43) is twice as long in the Greek as the corresponding MT. However, the Qumran texts testify to a version closer to the Greek text: of the eight hemistichs in Greek, three, five, six and eight correspond to the Masoretic text, while one, two, five, six, seven and eight correspond to 4QDeut^d (Van der Kooij, ‘Ending’, discusses this text and argues for the originality of the Qumran version).

Of particular interest is the use of the phrase *πάντες υἱοὶ θεοῦ* in parallel with *πάντες ἄγγελοι θεοῦ* (hemistichs two and four). In Wevers’s opinion these additional hemistichs were present in the translator’s Hebrew *Vorlage* (*Text Hist. Deuteronomy*, p. 534). Very similar hemistichs occur in v. 41b in the MT and LXX (Fernández Marcos, *Septuagint in Context*, p. 73).

These various data indicate clearly that the Hebrew text used by the translator of Deuteronomy was divergent from the Masoretic text. Further, it is clear that some of the differences from the Masoretic text found in the Greek translation are due not to the translator's insertion of additional material, but his rendering of his Hebrew *Vorlage*. It is difficult to establish that a specific theological *Tendenz* exists in the translation, particularly when the translator tends towards literalism. However, it is possible to make a number of observations and offer some tentative conclusions.

The Deuteronomy translator chose two terms to render the noun קהל 'assembly'. The other Pentateuch translators used συναγωγή as the equivalent for this and other nouns (e.g., הדרה, a term not found in MT Deuteronomy), reflecting the idea of a gathering and the assembly of Israel in particular. However, Greek Deuteronomy only used this equivalent twice (5.22; 33.4), introducing ἐκκλησία as an alternative rendering (18.16; 23.2[1], 3[2]; 31.30). It also used the cognate verb ἐκκλησιάζειν (4.10; 31.12, 28; cf. Lev. 8.3; Num. 20.8 and ἐξεκκλησιάζειν in Lev. 8.4; Num. 20.10). This terminology has a significant history of prior usage in Greek literature to define assemblies of various kinds, with particular reference to the Greek *polis*. The translator's choice of this term may reflect the Alexandrian Jewish community's desire for clarity about its political status within Ptolemaic Alexandria.

In Deut. 1.5 the translator chose διασαφήσαι τὸν νόμον τοῦτον 'to clarify this law' (NETS) to render the Hebrew באר את התורה הזאת 'to explain this law' (NRSV). Both the Greek and Hebrew verbs occur rarely in the Jewish canon, but the translator's choice represents the sense well. What is intriguing is that this Greek verb and its cognate noun διασάφησις are also employed in two contexts where the interpretation of dreams is at issue (Gen. 40.8; Dan. 2.6 [OG]). By choosing this rendering the translator may be connecting Moses' activities with his prophetic status. In Deut. 34.10 Moses is characterised as a prophet like no other, whom 'the Lord knew face-to-face'. The ability to 'clarify' the meaning of God's law certainly fits a prophet's role.

'This law' (1.5) must be the contents of τὸ δευτερονόμιον, the second law, because many times the translator, following his Hebrew text, defines this treatise as 'the words of this law' (27.3, 26; 28.58; 29.28[29];

31.9, 12, 24) or ‘the book of this law’ (28.61). Every seven years Moses commands Israel to ‘read this law before all Israel’ (31.11). ‘This law’ defines then ‘the words of the covenant’ which God established for Israel through Moses ‘in the land of Moab’, but this is a covenant made in addition to the one God made ‘at Choreb’ (28.69[29.1]) according to the translator. He seems to distinguish Moses’ teaching at Choreb from his teaching in the land of Moab, and, thus, this book truly is ‘the second law’.

The Greek also emphasised Israel’s anticipated possession of ‘the land Yahweh swore to their fathers’. There is considerable clustering of terms that relate to this idea: κλῆρος ‘allotment’, κληρονομία ‘inheritance’, κληρονομεῖν ‘to inherit; to possess in a way that cannot be reversed’ (*TDNT*, vol. III, p. 779), κατακληρονομεῖν ‘to cause to inherit or possess’. At times these terms create significant repetitions in a verse, as in 19.14:

οὐ μετακινήσεις ὄρια τοῦ πλησίον, ἃ ἔστησαν οἱ πατέρες σου ἐν τῇ κληρονομίᾳ, ἣ κατεκληρονομήσθης ἐν τῇ γῆ, ἣ κύριος ὁ θεός σου δίδωσίν σοι κληρονομήσαι.

You shall not move your neighbour’s boundaries, which your fathers have set up on the inheritance you were allotted in the land that the Lord your God is giving you to inherit. (NETS)

The translator engages in some lexical levelling, for the Hebrew text used two different roots to describe the notions of possession. In other contexts (e.g., 12.29) the translator injects difference through his lexical choices where there is none expressed specifically in the Hebrew text. A text such as 21.16, which addresses the laws of inheritance, indicates how this Greek terminology expresses the concept of inheritance. In Exod. 4.2 Yahweh named Israel ‘my firstborn son’, and in the context of covenant he spells out the ‘inheritance’ he will provide his son, Israel, namely the land of Canaan. Numbers and Deuteronomy tell the story of Yahweh’s actions to cause Israel to ‘inherit’ this land by taking up residence in it (κατοικεῖν) and finding rest (καταπαύειν) in it.

The relationship between Israel and God is defined by the covenant given originally at Sinai and which now Moses is ‘clarifying’ in the land

of Moab (28.69 [29.1]) through his oral rehearsal forty years later. The translator follows the theological perspective of the Hebrew text by and large, but uses various means, particularly lexical choice and small additions for emphasis. Two examples cast further light on this. His use of the terms ἔθνος and λαός is similar to that employed by the other Pentateuch translators. Non-Israelites generally are referred to by the noun ἔθνος, unless the translator wants to emphasise that Israel is a nation like other nations (e.g., 4.34; 9.14; 26.5). Conversely, Israel normally is defined by the term λαός (exceptions are found in 33.5, 21). The contrast between these two terms finds expression in a passage such as 32.43: εὐφράνθητε, ἔθνη, μετὰ τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ ('Be glad, O nations, with his people', reflecting MT's מְעַיֵן).

Another example occurs in the addition found in 23.18(17). Interaction with other peoples requires careful negotiation. Deuteronomy is replete with warnings about Israel's potential apostasy because of syncretism. The translator has inserted a doublet in 23.18(17) that is not represented in the Masoretic text:

οὐκ ἔσται τελεσφόρος ἀπὸ θυγατέρων Ἰσραὴλ, καὶ οὐκ ἔσται τελισκόμενος ἀπὸ υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ.

There shall not be an initiate among the daughters of Israel, and there shall not be anyone initiated among the sons of Israel. (NETS)

The first part of the verse forbids Israelites from participating in cultic fertility rites as practiced by surrounding nations. This addition, however, seems to make application of this principle to Hellenistic religious activity, perhaps an attempt to contextualise the translation to the translator's time.

VII. Reception History

The Greek text of Deuteronomy is cited very frequently in the New Testament writings. NA-28 lists around 200 quotations and probable allusions (pp. 843–45). Normally the New Testament materials follow the LXX, but variations occur. For example, in the citation from Deut. 6.4b-5 in Mk 12.29-30, the narrator has the same text for the most part, but adds a fourth element, καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς διανοίας 'and all your mind',

and in the last phrase substitutes ἰσχὺς ‘strength’ for δύναμις. The sense is little changed and the source of these alterations continues to be debated (Beale and Carson, *Commentary*, pp. 216–20).

New Greek translations of Deuteronomy were generated towards the end of the second century C.E., produced by individuals traditionally identified as Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion. Their motivation is diverse, with Aquila seeking to create a very literal translation, and Symmachus and Theodotion attempting a faithful but literarily more acceptable product. Today we possess only fragments of their translations, often contained in marginal notes of later manuscripts.

In the third century C.E. Origen created the Hexapla, probably to serve as a tool in the continuing debates between Judaism and Christianity. In this massive work he sought to compare the Greek translation with the Hebrew text that he possessed, primarily marking additions and omissions in the Greek text with various signs. His process also affected Greek word order. He incorporated the new translations of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion. His well-intentioned work created considerable confusion in the subsequent textual history of Greek Deuteronomy. The most complete witness to this Hexaplaric activity in Deuteronomy is the Syro-hexapla (Perkins, ‘Place’, pp. 223–32). There does not appear to be evidence of *kaige* revisional activity in the textual tradition of Deuteronomy. Further, Wevers does not identify any textual group in Greek Deuteronomy with the Lucianic recension.

Bibliography

- Aejmelaeus, A., *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators: Collected Essays* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1993).
- Parataxis in the LXX: A Study of the Renderings of the Hebrew Coordinate Clauses in the Greek Pentateuch* (AASF 31; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedekatemia, 1982).
- Beale, G.K., and D.A. Carson (eds.), *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007).
- Caird, G.B., ‘Towards a Lexicon of the Septuagint. I’, *JTS* 19 (1968), pp. 453–75.
- Collins, N., *The Library in Alexandria and the Bible in Greek* (Leiden: Brill, 2000).
- Dogniez, C., and M. Harl (eds.), *La Bible d’Alexandrie*. Vol. V, *Le Deutéronome* (Paris: Cerf, 2007).

The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint

- Duncan, J.A., 'A Critical Edition of Deuteronomy Manuscripts from Qumran Cave IV: 4QDt^b, 4QDt^c, 4QDt^h, 4QDtⁱ, 4QDt^k, 4QDt^l' (Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1989).
- Fernández Marcos, N., *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Versions of the Bible* (Leiden: Brill, 2000).
- Goldstein, J., *II Maccabees* (AB 41A; New York: Doubleday, 1983).
- Kooij, A. van der, 'The Ending of the Song of Moses: On the Pre-Masoretic Version of Deut 32:43', in F. García Martínez, et al. (eds.), *Studies in Deuteronomy* (Festschrift C.J. Labuschagne; VTSup 53; Leiden: Brill, 1994), pp. 93–100.
- Lee, J.A.L., *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch* (SBLSCS 14; Chico, CA: Society of Biblical Literature, 1983).
- Olofsson, S., *God Is My Rock: A Study of Translation Technique and Theological Exegesis in the Septuagint* (ConBOT 31; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1990).
- Perkins, L., 'The Place of Syh^T within the LXX Textual Tradition of Deuteronomy', in A. Pietersma and C. Cox (eds.), *De Septuaginta* (Festschrift J.W. Wevers; Toronto: Benben, 1984), pp. 223–32.
- Roberts, C.H., *Two Biblical Papyri in the John Rylands Library Manchester* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1936).
- Soisalon-Soininen, I., 'The Rendering of the Hebrew Relative Clause in the Greek Pentateuch', in A. Aejmelaeus and R. Sollamo (eds.), *Studien zur Septuaginta-Syntax* (Festschrift I. Soisalon-Soininen; AASF 237; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1987).
- Ulrich, E., 'The Greek Manuscripts of the Pentateuch from Qumran, Including Newly-Identified Fragments of Deuteronomy (4QLXXDeut)', in A. Pietersma and C. Cox (eds.), *De Septuaginta* (Toronto: Benben, 1984), pp. 71–82.
- Ulrich, E., et al., *Qumran Cave 4. IX Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings* (DJD XIV; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995).
- Walters, P., *The Text of the Septuagint: Its Corruptions and Their Emendations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973).
- Wevers, J.W., 'The Attitude of the Greek Translator of Deuteronomy Toward his Parent Text', in D. Donner, R. Hanhart, and R. Smend (eds.), *Beiträge zur alttestamentlichen Theologie* (Festschrift W. Zimmerli; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977), pp. 498–505.
- Wevers, J.W., and U. Quast (eds.), *Notes on the Greek Text of Deuteronomy* (SBLSCS 39; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995).
- Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum*. Vol. III.2, *Deuteronomium* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977).
- Text History of the Greek Deuteronomy* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978).

- White, S.A., 'A Critical Edition of Seven Manuscripts of Deuteronomy: 4QDt^a, 4QDt^c, 4QDt^d, 4QDt^f, 4QDt^g, 4QDtⁱ, and 4QDtⁿ' (Ph.D. Dissertation, Harvard University, 1988).
- Winston, D., *The Wisdom of Solomon* (AB 43; New York: Doubleday, 1979).
- Wittstruck, T., 'The Greek Translators of Deuteronomy' (Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1972).

Joshua

Michaël N. van der Meer

Editions

(a) Standard Greek Editions

Göttingen (none available at present).

Cambridge, vol. I.4, *Joshua, Judges and Ruth* (Brooke and McLean, 1917).

Rahlfs-Hanhart, vol. I, pp. 354–404.¹

Swete, vol. I, pp. 420–74.

(b) Other Greek Editions

Margolis (4 fasc. 1931–38; 5th fasc., ed. Tov 1992).²

(c) Modern Translations

NETS (Greenspoon, 2007), pp. 174–94.

LXX.D (Hertog and Kreuzer, 2009), pp. 218–42.

Bd'A 6 (Moatti-Fine, 1996).

La Biblia Griega, vol. II (Fernández Marcos *et al.*, 2011), pp. 17–74.

1. Rahlfs-Hanhart is based on only two manuscripts (A and B), and the two texts are presented in parallel columns in those passages where A and B differ drastically—the lists with toponyms in Josh. 15.21–62 and 18.22–19.45—leaving the question of the reconstruction of the Old Greek undecided.

2. Margolis developed his own idiosyncratic system of sigla that refer to the individual manuscripts and their grouping in five recensions (in his terminology the Egyptian, Syrian, Palestinian, Constantinopolitan recensions, which correspond by and large to what modern scholars would term the original Greek text, the Lucianic or Antiochene recension, the Hexaplaric recension and Catenae groups). As a result, Margolis's edition is rather difficult to handle. Furthermore, Margolis offers several conjectural emendations of the Greek text based on the MT. Although meticulously prepared, it is not completely free from errors.

(d) Additional Comments

Scholars of the Greek Joshua are advised to take the Rahlfs-Hanhart text as the point of departure and compare it with Margolis's text, while consulting the assessment of the differences between the two editions provided by Den Hertog ('Studien', pp. 30–109) in cases where the two differ. See further Bieberstein, *Lukian*, pp. 9–74; Den Hertog, 'Studien', pp. 3–29; and Van der Meer, *Formation*, pp. 22–32.

Recent manuscript discoveries have brought new material and new insights into the history of transmission and revision of the Greek Joshua. Thus, recently, pages from a pre-Hexaplaric codex, P.Schøyen 2648—in fact the oldest textual witness for LXX Joshua, dating from the early third century C.E.—have been found and published, adding information to the pre-Hexaplaric state of the Old Greek Joshua (De Troyer, 'LXX, *Joshua*'). Barthélemy's studies in the *kaige*-recension have led to a reconsideration of the Theodotonic material for Joshua (Greenspoon, *Textual Studies*).

I. General Characteristics

The Greek version of Joshua is by and large a relatively faithful rendering of the Hebrew book, comparable to the Greek version of the Pentateuch. It should be noted, however, that the Greek Joshua has some large-scale differences when compared to the MT. The Greek Joshua has some long pluses in the geographical sections which are commonly considered to be authentic (13.7-8; 15.59a; 21.36-37, see the apparatus in *BHS*). Other large pluses in the Greek Joshua have counterparts in the historical books (Deuteronomy to 1 Kings):

Table 1. Major pluses in LXX Joshua and their counterparts in Deuteronomy to 1 Kings:

Josh. 6.26a	MT 1 Kgs 16.34;
Josh. 16.10	MT 1 Kgs 9:16;
Josh. 19.47a, 48a	Judg. 1.34-35;
Josh. 21.42a-d	Josh. 19.49-50;
Josh. 24.4b-5a	Deut. 26.5-6;
Josh. 24.33a-b	Judg. 2.6, 11-14; 3.12, 14.

On the other hand, the Greek Joshua also lacks several phrases, clauses and complete verses present in MT, particularly in chs. 6 (Josh. 6.3b-4, 7b, 15b), 8 (Josh. 8.7b-8a, 13, 16a, 20b, 26), 10 (Josh. 10.15, 43), 13 (Josh. 13.33), and 20 (Josh. 20.4-5, 6b). In Josh. 5.2-12 the Hebrew and Greek versions seem to present diverging accounts of the circumcision and Passover narratives (see Van der Meer, *Formation*, pp. 249–88). Finally, in a few passages the order of the verses differs between the two versions.

Table 2. Differences in sequence between MT and LXX:

MT Josh. 8.30-35	LXX Josh. 9.2a-b
MT Josh. 19.47-48	LXX Josh. 19.48, 47a (cf. Judg. 1.34), 47, 48a (cf. Judg. 1.35)
MT Josh. 24.29-31	LXX Josh. 24.31, 29-30, 31a

II. Time and Place of Composition

Since the Greek Joshua shares with the Greek Pentateuch some distinctive characteristics in translation equivalents over against the other Greek translations of biblical books (e.g. Φυλιστιείμ instead of ἀλλοφύλος for פְּלִשְׁתִּים and θεράπων instead of παῖς for דָּבָר), it is generally assumed ‘that the Greek version (of Joshua) followed soon after that of the Law’ and was made therefore some time during the third century B.C.E. in Alexandria (Thackeray, *Grammar*, pp. 13–14; Redpath, ‘Contribution’; *Bd’A* 6, pp. 42–53).

A few scholars have made an attempt to offer a more precise date for the time and place of the translation. Den Hertog (‘Studien’, pp. 110–39) established a relative chronology for Greek Joshua between the Greek Pentateuch and Greek Judges on the basis of borrowed translations. He also argued that a comparison with the geographical description of Palestine in Greek Joshua and extrabiblical sources from the Hellenistic period, in particular the papyri from the Zenon archive dating from the middle of the third century B.C.E., makes it probable that the Greek translation of Joshua was made before the Seleucid reorganisation of Palestine after 198 B.C.E.

Van der Meer ('Provenance', pp. 59–61) believes to have found further evidence for a third-century B.C.E. date of Greek Joshua in *Aristobulus* (ca. 175 B.C.E.) fragment 3, which mentions a Greek translation of the events 'surrounding the exodus of Egypt of the Hebrews...as well as their domination of the land (καὶ κράτησις τῆς χώρας)'. Through examination of the vocabulary in the fields of Palestinian geography (those parts of Palestine that were of special economic and strategic importance for the Ptolemies, such as Jericho and its surroundings and Jamnia), warfare, jurisdiction and administration, he suggested the Greek translator of Joshua was connected with Dositheos son of Drimylos, a Jew with a high position at the court of the third and fourth Ptolemies, Euergetes I (246–222 B.C.E.) and Philopator (222–205 B.C.E.), known both from the documentary papyri and literary sources (3 Macc. 1.3; Polybius 5.81; 'Provenance', pp. 74–80).

The main purpose of the Greek translation of Joshua should perhaps not be sought in the liturgical needs of a synagogue community, but rather in the political interests both of an ethnic community trying to establish their cultural identity in a multicultural Empire and of rulers of that Empire who sought to maintain a much-disputed part of their territory. A late third-century B.C.E. Alexandrian provenance in the period between the fourth (219–217 B.C.E.) and fifth (202–195 B.C.E.) Syrian wars seems to be an attractive, albeit speculative, setting for the Greek translation of Joshua.

III. Language

The language and translation technique employed by the Greek translator of Joshua resemble that of the Greek Pentateuch. The Greek translator's language is that of Koine Greek attested not only by the Greek Pentateuch, but also by the documentary papyri and inscriptions from Ptolemaic Egypt. The relative freedom with which the translator rendered his Hebrew text corresponds with the relatively free style employed by the translators of the Pentateuch and can clearly be discerned from the literal and literalistic translations of later books, on the one hand, and the periphrastic style of the Greek versions of Proverbs and Esther or contemporising renderings like Daniel and Isaiah, on the other hand.

From a syntactical point of view, the Greek translator adhered relatively closely to his Semitic source text, as Sipilä ('Renderings'; *Between Literalness*) and Den Hertog ('Studien', pp. 160–80) have shown. Nevertheless, the translator occasionally employed genuine Greek syntactical constructions, such as the *genitive absolute*, *participium coniunctum*, *ὄτι-recitativum*, as well as specific macro-syntactical markers, such as *δέ* instead of *καί* for Hebrew *-ו*, *ἐπεὶ* and *ὡς* for Hebrew *ויהי* and *הָיָא* and *ὅταν* for Hebrew circumstantial *כִּי*. While these features point to a concern for stylistic elegance, there are also a number of instances where *καί* appears at the beginning of an *apodosis* and disturbs the Greek style, when a conjunction should have been omitted (Sipilä, *Between Literalness*, pp. 109–40, 196–98).

IV. Translation and Composition

Whereas later Greek translations are characterised by a high degree of stereotyping, literal renderings and transliterations, the Greek Joshua stands out for its high degree of variation in translation equivalents (Hollenberg, *Der Charakter*, pp. 4–9; *Bd'A 6*, pp. 42–68). The vocabulary of the Greek version is considerably larger than that of the Hebrew original. For common Hebrew words like *נכה* and *לחם* the Greek translator employed no less than fourteen and seven respectively different Greek equivalents (*Bd'A 6*, p. 54). In some cases, the main motive behind the different Greek renderings is simply the translator's wish to bring some variation to the repetitive style of his Hebrew text. In other cases, the variation is due to a particular interpretation of the Hebrew original. Thus in Josh. 24.9, the translator rendered the reference to Balak's confrontation with Israel, *וילחם בישראל* 'and he fought against Israel', by *καὶ παρετάξατο τῷ Ἰσραηλ* 'and set himself against Israel' (NETS) to accommodate the fact that Numbers 22–24 does not report a direct confrontation between Israel and Balak (Hollenberg, *Der Charakter*, pp. 5–6).

The Greek translator not only introduced changes on the qualitative level, but also on the quantitative level. LXX Josh. 6.2–25, for instance, contains a high number of adverbial phrases (e.g., *εὐτόνως*, *εὐθέως*, *ἐγγύθεν*) which are absent from the Hebrew text and could only have arisen at the level of the Greek translation since there are no obvious

counterparts in Hebrew (Van der Meer, ‘Sound the Trumpet’, pp. 36–39). Conversely, there are also examples where there can be no doubt that the Greek text reflects deliberate curtailment on the part of the translator, as for example in Josh. 5.8a, *וַיְהִי בְּאַשְׁרֵת־מֹו בְּלִהְגֹו לְהַמּוֹל*, where the translator condensed these clauses into a simple participial construction *περιτμηθέντες δέ* ‘Having been circumcised’ (Hollenberg, *Der Charakter*, p. 8). In contemporary scholarship there are widely diverging opinions regarding the question whether the larger omissions in the Greek text (see table 1) should be ascribed to the Greek translator as well (Rösel, ‘The Septuagint-Version’).

V. Key Text–Critical Issues

In view of the translation technique as a modest stylistic reshaping of a repetitive Hebrew text, Hollenberg (*Der Charakter*, pp. 12–20) argued that the major large-scale variants between MT and LXX that could not be attributed to these characteristics of the Greek translator should in fact be ascribed to a different Hebrew *Vorlage*. Thus the large LXX pluses in topographical sections in Josh. 13.7-8, 15.59a and 21.36-37 are attributed by Hollenberg to a different Hebrew *Vorlage* than the MT. In his view (*Der Charakter*, p. 15), this qualification also holds true for the major minuses in LXX Joshua 20. Here the large-scale pluses in MT transform the shorter description of Joshua’s execution of the commands found in the priestly version of the laws on the cities of refuge (Num. 35.9-34) into a prescriptive text that incorporates further regulations regarding the cities of refuge, drawn to a large extent from the deuteronomic legislation (Deut. 19.1-13). According to Hollenberg, this example shows that the process of literary formation of the book of Joshua was not yet closed when the Greek translation was made. It is this that has generated much of the present-day interest in the Greek Joshua. The example of Joshua 20 continues to be a cornerstone in theories about the overlap between text-critical and redaction-critical data (Rofé, ‘Joshua 20’; Tov, *Textual Criticism*, pp. 327–32). Most of the discussion after Hollenberg’s pioneering work has been devoted to the question whether (and which of the) other variants in Greek Joshua reflect a stage in the process of literary formation of the book prior to the stage attested by the MT (Van der Meer, *Formation*, pp. 32–91).

In response to the minimalistic position taken in commentaries on Joshua at the turn of the twentieth century, Holmes defended the thesis that the Greek and Hebrew texts of Joshua are two successive stages in the process of the book's literary formation. Whereas previous scholars had treated the variants between LXX and MT in a rather atomistic way, Holmes pointed to the inner logic of the shorter LXX version and the coherence of the pluses in MT. The fact, for instance, that in Josh. 5.11-12 both the phrase *ממחרת הפסח* 'on the day after Passover' and the phrase *ממחרת* 'on the day' are not represented in Greek cannot be attributed to scribal error. Rather they must reflect a later redaction of the shorter Hebrew version underlying LXX that sought to adjust the Joshua narrative to the priestly regulations in Lev. 23.4-8, 9-14 (see already Hollenberg, 'Textkritik', pp. 97-98).

Even more important for Holmes is LXX Josh. 5.2-9, which seems to reflect a heterodox piece of Israelite historiography in which circumcision was not yet universally practised by the Israelites. A later Jewish reviser, in Holmes's view, wanted to conceal this presentation and produced the now ponderous Hebrew text in vv. 4-5 stressing the fact that 'the entire nation' (*כל-העם* absent from LXX) was circumcised. In a similar vein, he would have added the words *כל-הגוי* 'all the people' in v. 8 (see section § III above), and also introduced the element of a 'second circumcision' by adding the word *שנית* 'second' in v. 2. As a result, for Holmes, the MT reflects a systematic and coherent expansion of the older Hebrew version which is reflected faithfully in the LXX. In his model the value of the LXX extends the borders of so-called 'lower criticism' (textual criticism) into that of the 'higher criticism' (redaction criticism).

Benjamin's study of the quantitative variants between MT and LXX in Joshua 1-12 ('Variations') reduced the inner coherence between the variants to individual glosses either in the Hebrew or Greek texts of Joshua. However, the findings of the biblical scrolls from Qumran (4QJer^b, 4QSam^a, 4QJosh^a) as well as renewed interest in the ancient versions of the Hebrew Bible (for instance the Targumim) gave much support to the idea that the variants (both quantitative and qualitative) between the two texts of Joshua should be studied as a coherent whole. The question, however, which version deliberately reworked the other remained (and remains) a matter of debate.

Gooding ('Traditions') pointed to the inconsistencies in Holmes's argument regarding LXX Josh. 5.2-9 and saw a midrashic exegesis at work behind the Greek translation. On the other hand, Orlinksy ('Hebrew *Vorlage*') and his pupil Chesman ('Studies') strongly supported Holmes's thesis of revision on the Hebrew level. Auld ('Joshua') also advocated a return to the thesis defended by Holmes, although in his view the pluses in MT are instances of the process of progressive supplementation rather than a coherent independent redaction of the book. Some of the additions to the shorter Hebrew text (MT Josh. 8.9, 13; 10.15, 43) reflect a 'pedantic concern for the location of the camp and the precise whereabouts of Joshua himself at any given moment' (Auld, 'Joshua', p. 5; see also De Troyer, 'Did Joshua').

Tov's bifocal approach to the variants between the Hebrew and Greek versions of Joshua may be illustrative for the complexities involved with assessing the text-critical and redaction-critical value of the Septuagint of Joshua. On the one hand, he has elaborated the idea of midrashic exegesis underlying the Greek Joshua (Tov, 'Midrash-type'), while on the other hand he considers the same Greek translation to be a major witness to the process of literary growth of the book (Tov, 'Midrash-type'). Regarding the Passover narrative in Josh. 5.10-12, Tov ('Growth', p. 330) considers the pluses in MT to be part of a second edition of the book. Yet, he also finds evidence of a midrashic modification of the same passage by the Greek translator who transformed the time for Passover from 'in the evening' (בערב) to the time from the evening (ἀπὸ ἑσπέρας) onwards and rendered the phrase 'unleavened bread and parched grain' (מצות וקלוי) in light of the regulations found in Lev. 23.10-14 as ἄζυμα καὶ νέα (Tov, 'Growth', pp. 54-57). According to Tov, the pluses throughout MT result from a Hebrew editor whose main concern was to emphasise, elucidate, harmonise and amplify the shorter Hebrew text. Of special importance are the additions that betray the influence of Deuteronomy, as they would form a point of contact and continuity between the history of re-editing and the history of redaction of the book, which was shaped by Deuteronomistic scribes.

Whereas for Tov the variants between MT and LXX may bring us back to the time when the two Hebrew versions branched off from the common source, sometime during the Persian or early Ptolemaic period, Rofé ('End') has argued that the Old Greek Joshua may even bring us

back to the Assyrian period. In his view the major LXX pluses at the end of the book, LXX Josh. 24.31a, 33a-b, contain ancient historiographical material presenting Joshua rather than Moses as the one who had led the Israelites out of Egypt (24.31a ὅτε ἐξήγαγεν αὐτοὺς ἐξ Αἰγύπτου). According to Rofé, the plus at LXX Josh. 24.33a-b constitutes the original connection between Joshua 24 and the beginning of the original core of the Judges narratives, Judg. 3.12-30. This original transition, reflected also in the Damascus Document (CD 5.1-5), would then derive from an eighth-century B.C.E. Ephraimite History and was later substituted by the longer Deuteronomistic prefaces to the Judges cycles, Judg. 1.1–2.5; 2.6–3.6; 3.7-11) attested by both the MT and LXX versions of that book.

Further contributions to the issue of the redaction-critical and historiographical value of the Old Greek Joshua were made by Mazor in her unpublished dissertation ('Septuagint Translation') and a number of articles. In her view ('Septuagint Translation', pp. 163–70), both the MT and LXX of Joshua reflect editorial reworking of the Joshua narratives on the Hebrew level. Although the Greek translation can be qualified as relatively free, it is literal enough to ascribe all literary activity to the Hebrew stages preceding the translation. In Mazor's view ('Origin'), the plus in LXX Josh. 6.26a reflects an ancient historiographical parallel to the narrative of a city built by Ozan at the cost of two of his sons, as preserved in the original story of 1 Chron. 7.21a-24a. With respect to the preceding narrative, Josh. 6.1-20, she argues for the originality of the MT version, whereas the pluses in LXX Josh. 6.9, 13, 20, mentioning explicitly the priests (καὶ οἱ ἱερεῖς ἐσάλπισαν ταῖς σάλπιξι), would reflect a nomistic reworking of the narrative. The motive behind the alterations would have been the wish to conform to the original story in which the *shofar* was blown by lay people to the priestly legislation found in Num. 10.1-10, which reserves this right exclusively for the Aaronide priests (cf. Tg. Jon., Josephus, *Ant.* 5.22-23, 27 and the War Scroll). With respect to the story of the fall of Ai (Josh. 8.1-29), she argued (Mazor, 'Textual') that the Old Greek version reflects an intermediate stage between the pristine narrative contained in 4QJosh^a (lacking Josh. 8.14b-17) and the expansionistic MT (including the pluses *vis-à-vis* LXX found in Josh. 8.7b-8a, 9b, 12, 13, 15b-16, 20b and 26). In her view, the textual accretions resulted from narrative conflation with Judges 20, a narrative with a similar plot.

In reaction to these maximalist positions, scholars over the last decade have pointed once more to the interpretative character of the Greek translation. In a careful text-critical analysis of Joshua 6, Bieberstein (*Josua–Jordan–Jericho*, pp. 230–67) concluded that most of the major divergences between MT and LXX in these chapters are the result of a deliberate restructuring and reformulation by the translator. Although in his view the book has had a very long process of literary formation, there is no overlap between the history of redaction and textual transmission as argued to varying degrees by Holmes, Orlinsky, Auld, Tov, Rofé, Mazor and De Troyer.

Van der Meer (*Formation*; ‘Sound the Trumpet’) reached a similar conclusion through careful examinations of chs. 1, 5, 6 and 8 of the book. He determines that a redaction must be discernible on the basis of both a distinctive vocabulary and ideology, as is the case with the commonly accepted deuteronomistic, nomistic and priestly layers of the book. Therefore, a redaction-critical analysis of the Hebrew text of these chapters in its own right makes clear that the Greek version of Joshua does not attest to a stage in the literary formation of the book prior to MT, but rather reflects an attempt to harmonise the tensions that, seen from a modern critical perspective, arose out of these redactional additions.

For Van der Meer (*Formation*, pp. 249–415), the variants in Josh. 5.2–12 should all be ascribed to the Greek translator, who was no less puzzled than modern readers by the Deuteronomistic fiction of a second circumcision of the entire male Israelite population on enemy grounds just before battle (Josh. 4.21–5.8). The Greek translator not only smoothed these crude notions by turning primitive flint knives into sharp knives (5.2–3 *μαχαίρας πετρίνας ἐκ πέτρας ἀκροτόμου*) and deliberately introducing a period of recuperation (5.8 *ἡσυχίαν εἶχον...ἕως ὑγιάσθησαν*), but also enhanced the historical plausibility by transforming the hill made of foreskins into a toponym (5.3 *ἐπὶ τοῦ καλουμένου τόπου Βουνὸς τῶν ἀκροβυστιῶν*). From a careful reading of Numbers 10–14 and an interpretation of the phrase ‘disgrace of Egypt’ in Josh. 5.9 in the light of the preceding circumcision narrative, the translator corrected the period of the wandering through the desert from forty years to forty-two years, condensed the ponderous Deuteronomistic style of (MT) Josh. 5.4–5 and differentiated between two groups of Israelites: those born during the period of wandering in the desert (*οἱ ποτὲ ἐγένοντο ἐν τῇ ὁδοῦ*) and

those that had not yet been circumcised when Israel left Egypt (καὶ ὅσοι ποτὲ ἀπερίτμητοι ἦσαν τῶν ἐξεληλυθόντων ἐξ Αἰγύπτου) and had been young enough to have escaped the verdict over all male Israelites after two years of desert wandering (Num. 14.23) and who now, after their circumcision, had finally been released from the disgrace of the Israelites (τὸν ὀνειδισμόν Αἰγύπτου, 5.9).

In a similar vein, both the small minuses throughout the Greek Joshua (Van der Meer, *Formation*, pp. 161–248) and the drastic curtailments in Josh. 6.2-25 (‘Sound the Trumpet’) and Josh. 8.1-29 (*Formation*, pp. 417–78), as well as the transposition of the famous Ebal passage (MT Josh. 8.30-35, LXX Josh. 9.2a-e, cf. 4QJosh^a; *Formation*, pp. 479–522) can be understood as attempts to enhance the historical plausibility and inner and external coherence of the narratives, and to smoothen the tensions in the text that modern scholars would otherwise interpret in a redaction-critical way. Seen thus, the Septuagint of Joshua is not a literal version of an ancient heterodox historiography, but rather a careful exegesis and an intelligent and stylistic reformulation of the Hebrew text as attested by MT.

Although much work has been done in assessing the text-critical value of the Septuagint of Joshua, it should be noted that thus far the discussion has concentrated mainly on the first ten chapters of the Greek Joshua whereas the latter part of the book has received comparatively little attention. Furthermore it can also be observed that many studies tend to disregard the history of previous research. For instance, the recent commentary to the Septuagint of Joshua by Auld (*Joshua*) interacts only with the studies by Holmes, Moatti-Fine, Den Hertog and Sipilä and comments only on a single Septuagint manuscript (Vaticanus). It is to be expected, therefore, that future research on the Greek Joshua will be more comprehensive.

VI. Ideology and Exegesis

Whereas the translator’s concern for style, variation and contextual harmonisation can be detected throughout the Greek Joshua, particularly in the first part of the book, there is little evidence for specific ideological and contemporising renderings. In the case of Josh. 24.27 where the

Greek version seems to introduce an eschatological element into the text, the plus ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν does not so much point to the end of days, but rather creates a link backwards to Deut. 31.29 (Den Hertog, 'Eschatologisierung', pp. 110–13).

In cases where ideology can be discerned in the Greek Joshua, the main motive seems to be to avoid associations with improper religious notions. Thus, the translator avoided the anthropomorphic notion of the 'mouth of the Lord' (פי יהוה, 9.14; 15.13; 17.4; 19.50; 21.33; 22.9) and employed the word for a royal edict, πρόσταγμα, instead. Likewise, he modified the expression 'voice of the Lord' (קול יהוה, 5.6) by means of another administrative term ἐντολή, and altered the notion of the 'hand of the Lord' (יד יהוה, 4.24) into that of the 'strength of the Lord' (δύναμις τοῦ κυρίου) (Hollenberg, *Der Charakter*, p. 9; Orlinksy, 'Hebrew Vorlage', pp. 193–94; *Bd'A* 6, pp. 49–50).

In the case of the Transjordanian altar (Josh 22.9–34), the translator rendered Hebrew מזבח 'altar' with the Greek word for pagan altars, βωμός, as long as it seems to refer to an illegitimate Jewish altar outside the Holy Land (Cisjordanian Palestine). As soon as the legitimate status of the place of worship is established in the narrative, the same Hebrew מזבח is rendered with a Greek neologism, θυσιαστήριον (*Bd'A* 6, pp. 51–52). For the cities of refuge (Joshua 20–21), the translator carefully avoided the term ἀσυλία 'inviolability', which was widely used in the Hellenistic world to indicate the inviolability of major sanctuaries, but employed the neologism φυγαδευτήριον 'place of refuge' instead.

Furthermore, the Greek version of Josh. 24.1, 25 sets Joshua's renewal of the covenant not in the uncrowned capital of Northern Israel, Shechem (שכם), but rather in Shiloh (Σηλω). Although the secondary nature of the reading in LXX is widely acknowledged (Holmes, *Joshua*, p. 78; Auld, 'Joshua', p. 14), there is debate first whether this alteration was already made in the Hebrew preceding the stage of the Greek translation or simply reflects another initiative introduced by the Greek translator, and second whether the change was made only for the sake of harmonisation with the preceding narratives (Josh. 18.1, 8–10; 19.51; 21.2; 22.9, 12) or also reflects anti-Samaritan polemics (Hollenberg, *Der Charakter*, p. 17).

VII. Reception History

The book of Joshua did not play a major role in the reception history of the Bible during the Hellenistic and Roman periods (Noort, 'Joshua'). In Ptolemaic times, figures like Joseph, Moses and Solomon served as figures to emulate (cf. *Jos.Asen.*, *Ps.-Hec.*, *Aristob.*, *Art.*, *Dem.*, *Ezek.Trag.* and *Eupol.*). When references were made to the Joshua stories, it was mainly the Hebrew rather than the Greek Joshua that was taken up. Thus the themes of Joshua as Moses' successor in Sir. 46.1-6 (אהבה בנבואה—διαδόχος Μωυσῆ ἐν προφητείαις 'a successor to Moses in prophecy') and Acts 7.45, and the miraculous fall of Jericho (2 Macc. 12.15; cf. 4Q479 frg. 22 and 4QTestim; Heb. 11.30), are based on the Hebrew book.

Apparently, New Testament authors found it easier to take Rahab as a figure for emulation (Heb. 11.31; Jas 2.25) rather than a military leader. Some reminiscences of phraseology from the Greek Joshua are apparent in the New Testament: both LXX Josh 1.13, 15; 11.23; 21.42; 22.4; 23.1 and Heb. 4.8 employ the verb καταπαύω for the rest after war. Perhaps the same holds true for Philo's *Conf.* 166, οὐ μὴ σε ἀνῶ, οὐδ' οὐ μὴ σε ἐγκαταλίπω 'I will never leave you nor forsake you', which seems to quote LXX Josh. 1.5.

Both New Testament authors and Philo show little interest in the military achievements of Joshua. This seems to be the case for *LAB* 20–24 as well, where the military elements have given way to the cultic parts of the book (cf. Josh. 1; 5.10–12; 8.30–35; 22.10–34; and 24). Inversely, Flavius Josephus portrays Joshua as the ideal στρατηγός 'general' (Feldman, 'Josephus' Portrait'). His Greek presentation of the history of Israel for a Greek audience not only draws upon the Greek Joshua, but also shares with it a similar concern (§ II).

Bibliography

- Auld, A.G., 'Joshua: The Hebrew and Greek Texts', in J. Emerton (ed.), *Studies in the Historical Books of the Old Testament* (VTSup 30; Leiden: Brill, 1979), pp. 1–14.
- Joshua: Jesus Son of Naue in Codex Vaticanus* (Septuagint Commentary Series; Leiden: Brill, 2005).

- Benjamin, C.D., 'The Variations between the Hebrew and Greek Texts of Joshua: Chapters 1–12' (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania; Leipzig: W. Drugulin, 1921).
- Bieberstein, K., *Josua–Jordan–Jericho. Archäologie, Geschichte und Theologie der Landnahmeerzählungen Josua 1–6* (OBO 143; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1995).
- Lukian und Theodotion im Josuabuch mit einem Beitrag zu den Josuarollen von Hirbet Qumran* (BNB 7; Munich: K. Urlaub, 1994).
- Brooke, A.E., and N. McLean (eds.), *Joshua, Judges and Ruth* (The Old Testament in Greek, 1, 4; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1917).
- Chesman, E.A., 'Studies in the Septuagint of the Book of Joshua' (Ph.D. dissertation, Hebrew Union College, New York, 1967).
- De Troyer, K., 'Did Joshua Have a Crystal Ball? The Old Greek and the MT of Joshua 10:15, 17 and 23', in S.M. Paul *et al.* (eds.), *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (VTSup 94; Leiden: Brill, 2003), pp. 571–89.
- 'LXX, Joshua IX 33–XI 3 (MS 2648)', in R. Pintaudi (ed.), *Papyri graecae Schøyen (PSchøyen I)* (Papyrologica Florentina 35; Firenze: Gonnelli, 2005), pp. 81–145.
- Feldman, L.H., 'Josephus' Portrait of Joshua', *HTR* 82 (1989), pp. 351–76.
- Gooding, D.W., 'Traditions of Interpretation of the Circumcision at Gilgal', in A. Shinan (ed.), *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies, Held at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 13–19 August, 1973, under the Auspices of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, Division A* (Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1977), pp. 149–64.
- Greenspoon, L.J., *Textual Studies in the Book of Joshua* (HSM 28; Chico: Scholars Press, 1983).
- Hertog, C.G. den, 'Eschatologisierung in der griechischen Übersetzung des Buches Josua', in F. Postma, K. Spronk and E. Talstra (eds.), *The New Things: Eschatology in Old Testament Prophecy* (Festschrift H. Leene; Amsterdamse Cahiers voor Exegese van de Bijbel en zijn Tradities Supplement Series 3; Maastricht: Shaker, 2002), pp. 107–17.
- 'Studien zur griechischen Übersetzung des Buches Josua' (Ph.D. dissertation, Justus-Liebig Universität; Gießen, 1996). [Pages 160–80 published separately in *BIOSCS* 29 (1996), pp. 22–52]
- Hertog, C.G. den, and S. Kreuzer, 'Jesus. Das Buch Josua', in W. Kraus and M. Karrer (eds.), *Septuaginta Deutsch. Das griechische Alte Testament in deutscher Übersetzung* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2009), pp. 218–42.
- 'Jesus. Iosue. Das Buch Josua', in M. Karrer and W. Kraus (eds.), *Septuaginta Deutsch. Erläuterungen und Kommentare zum griechischen Alten Testament* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2011), vol. I, pp. 605–56.

- Hollenberg, J., *Der Charakter der alexandrinischen Uebersetzung des Buches Josua und ihr textkritischer Werth untersucht* (Wissenschaftliche Beilage zu dem Oster-Programm des Gymnasiums zu Moers; Moers: J.G. Edner, 1876).
- Hollenberg, J., 'Zur Textkritik des Buches Josua und des Buches der Richter', *ZAW* 1 (1881), pp. 97–105.
- Holmes, S., *Joshua: The Hebrew and Greek Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1914).
- Margolis, M.L., *The Book of Joshua in Greek according to the Critically Restored Text with an Apparatus Containing the Variants of the Principal Recensions and of the Individual Witnesses* (Publications of the Alexander Kohut Memorial Foundation, Parts 1–4: Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1931–38; Part 5 with a preface by E. Tov: Philadelphia: The Annenberg Research Institute, 1992).
- Mazor, L., 'A Nomistic Reworking of the Jericho Conquest Narrative Reflected in LXX to Joshua 6:1-20', *Textus* 18 (1995), pp. 47–62.
- 'The Origin and Evolution of the Curse Upon the Rebuilder of Jericho: A Contribution of Textual Criticism to Biblical Historiography', *Textus* 14 (1988), pp. 1–26.
- 'The Septuagint Translation of the Book of Joshua: Its Contribution to the Understanding of the Textual Transmission of the Book and Its Literary and Ideological Development' (Hebrew; Ph.D. dissertation, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1994).
- 'A Textual and Literary Study of the Fall of Ai in Joshua 8' (Hebrew), in S. Japhet (ed.), *The Bible in the Light of Its Interpreters* (Sarah Kamin Memorial Volume; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1994), pp. 73–108.
- Meer, M.N. van der, 'Clustering Cluttered Areas: Textual and Literary Criticism in Joshua 18,1-10', in E. Noort (ed.), *The Book of Joshua* (BETHL 250; Leuven: Peeters, 2012), pp. 87–106.
- Formation and Reformulation: The Redaction of the Book of Joshua in the Light of the Oldest Textual Witnesses* (VTSup 102; Leiden: Brill, 2004).
- 'Provenance, Profile, and Purpose of the Greek Joshua', in M.K.H. Peters (ed.), *XII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Leiden, 2004* (SBLSCS 54; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), pp. 55–80.
- 'Sound the Trumpet! Redaction and Reception of Joshua 6:2-25', in J.T.A.G. van Ruiten and C. de Vos (eds.), *The Land of Israel in Bible, History and Theology* (Festschrift E. Noort; VTSup 30; Leiden: Brill, 2009), pp. 19–43.
- Moatti-Fine, J. (ed.), *La Bible d'Alexandrie*. Vol. VI, *Jésus (Josué)* (Paris: Cerf, 1996).
- Noort, E., 'Joshua. The History of Reception and Hermeneutics', in J.C. de Moor and H.F. van Rooy (eds.), *Past, Present, Future: The Deuteronomistic History and the Prophets* (OTS 44; Leiden: Brill, 2000), pp. 199–215.

- Orlinsky, H.M., 'The Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Septuagint of the Book of Joshua', in *Congress Volume, Rome 1968* (VTSup 17; Leiden: Brill, 1969), pp. 187–95.
- Redpath, H.A., 'A Contribution towards Settling Dates of the Translation of the Various Books of the Septuagint', *JTS* 6 (1906), pp. 606–14.
- Rofé, A., 'The End of the Book of Joshua according to the Septuagint', *Henoah* 4 (1982), pp. 17–35 [translation of Hebrew original published in *Shnaton* 2 (1977), pp. 217–27].
- 'Joshua 20: Historico–Literary Criticism Illustrated', in J.H. Tigay (ed.), *Empirical Models for Biblical Criticism* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1985), pp. 131–47 [translation of Hebrew original published in A. Rofé and Y. Zakovitch (eds.), *Essays on the Bible and the Ancient World* (Isac Leo Seeligmann Volume; Jerusalem: E. Rubinstein, 1983), pp. 137–50].
- Rösel, M., 'The Septuagint-Version of the Book of Joshua', *SJOT* 16 (2002), pp. 5–23 [translation of German original published in H.-J. Fabry and U. Offerhaus (eds.), *Im Brennpunkt: Die Septuaginta. Studien zur Entstehung und Bedeutung der griechischen Bibel* 1 [BWANT 153; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2001], pp. 197–211].
- Sipilä, S., *Between Literalness and Freedom: Translation Technique in the Septuagint of Joshua and Judges Regarding the Clause Connections Introduced by ו and כ* (PFES 75; Helsinki: The Finnish Exegetical Society; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999).
- 'A Note to the Users of Margolis' Joshua-Edition', *BIOSCS* 26 (1993), pp. 17–21.
- 'The Renderings of ויהי and ויהיה as Formulas in the LXX of Joshua', in L. Greenspoon and O. Munnich (eds.), *VIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Paris 1992* (SBLSCS 41; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), pp. 273–89.
- Tov, E., 'The Growth of the Book of Joshua in the Light of the Evidence of the LXX Translation', in S. Japhet (ed.), *Studies in Bible 1986* (Scripta Hierosolymitana 31; Jerusalem: Magnes, 1986), pp. 321–39 [reprinted in E. Tov, *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (VTSup 72; Leiden: Brill, 1999), pp. 385–96].
- 'Midrash-type Exegesis in the LXX of Joshua', *RB* 85 (1978), pp. 50–61 [reprinted in E. Tov, *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (VTSup 72; Leiden: Brill, 1999), pp. 153–64].
- Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (2nd ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001).

Judges

Philip E. Satterthwaite

Editions

(a) Standard Greek Editions

Göttingen (none available at present).

Cambridge, vol. I.4, *Joshua, Judges and Ruth* (Brooke and McLean, 1917).

Rahlfs-Hanhart, vol. I, pp. 405–94.¹

Swete, vol. I, pp. 475–537.

(b) Modern Translations

NETS (Satterthwaite, 2007), pp. 195–238.

LXX.D (Kabiersch *et al.*, 2009), pp. 243–93.

Bd'A 7 (Harlé, 1999).

La Biblia Griega, vol. II (Fernández Marcos *et al.*, 2011), pp. 75–170.

I. General Characteristics

LXX Judges is a generally accurate translation of a text-form almost identical to the Masoretic Text (MT). It usually conveys the sense of the Hebrew adequately, though often in unidiomatic Greek. The textual history of LXX Judges is complex, and any evaluation of LXX Judges must take into account the distinctive characteristics of the various manuscript groups. We begin, therefore, with a description of these groups.

Rahlfs identified two main textual traditions in LXX Judges, which he believed were so diverse that they amounted to separate recensions (editions) of the book. He printed these as separate texts, designated A

1. Both Rahlfs-Hanhart and the NETS translation (based on Rahlfs-Hanhart) present codices A and B in separate columns.

and B. He based his A text upon Codex Alexandrinus (A) and two groups of manuscripts representing the recensions associated with Origen (ca. 185–253 C.E.) and Lucian (ca. 250–312 C.E.), which he termed O and L respectively. His B text was based upon Codex Vaticanus (B).

Later scholarship has refined Rahlfs's classifications. The witnesses to an A-type of text are now divided into three groups, AI, AII and AIII. Of these AI corresponds broadly to Rahlfs's O-group, and AII to his L-group. The B-type of text is now held to be represented by two distinct groups. Soisalon-Soininen grouped the manuscripts as follows (*Die Textformen*, pp. 20–21; followed by Bodine, *Greek Text*, pp. 2–3):

- AI: A G a b c k x
- AII: the subgroups K Z g l n (o) w and (d) p t v²
- AIII: MNhyb₂
- B: the subgroups B (d) e f j m (o) q s z and i m r u a₂

Whereas scholarship in the decades before Rahlfs usually argued for the independence of the traditions represented by A and B, it is now accepted that the A and B traditions probably derive from a single archetype. This was one conclusion of Soisalon-Soininen's monograph. He discussed many aspects of LXX Judges which indicated that the different groups had a common basis (Soisalon-Soininen, *Textformen*, pp. 31–33), such as additions or omissions in LXX *vis-à-vis* the Hebrew mostly shared by all the groups (the additions usually intended to clarify the meaning, the omissions usually made in order to avoid obscurity). Regarding word order, he noted that normally all the LXX groups match the word order of MT strictly, but that where there are deviations from MT's word order, these exceptions occur almost unanimously across all the groups, not what one would have expected from two independent translations (*Textformen*, pp. 33–37). Similarly, most of the Hebraisms in Judges occur across all the groups at the same points in the text (*Textformen*, pp. 43–49).

2. The brackets around d and o indicate that they have a mixed text, which is aligned sometimes with K Z g l n w and sometimes with B e f j m q s z. Note, further, that scholars today tend to describe text-forms like Rahlfs's L as 'Antiochene' or 'proto-Lucianic' rather than 'Lucianic', because it has since become clear that many of the allegedly 'Lucianic' features of such text-forms are attested long before Lucian (Dines, *Septuagint*, pp. 103–106).

Of these groups, Soisalon-Soininen argued, AII tends to write more idiomatic Greek than the others (*Textformen*, p. 38 on translation of the conjunction τ ; p. 50 on translation of $\psi\alpha$; below, § IV), and the B-group is generally closest to MT (*Textformen*, pp. 59–60); but all groups reflect the influence of Origen’s Hexapla. These conclusions still seem sound. A clear sign of Hexaplaric influence is the presence within all the main groups of doublets—double translations of words or phrases within a single manuscript, a tendency encouraged by the bringing together of variant readings in the different columns of the Hexapla (Schreiner, *Septuaginta-Massora*, pp. 90–104).

A major development since Soisalon-Soininen has been the identification of a *kaige* revision within the textual tradition of LXX Judges, a revision towards a form of the text close to or identical with MT, which contains frequent ‘quantitative equivalents’ (stock renderings of particular Hebrew words and phrases), often producing unidiomatic Greek. Credit for identifying *kaige* in LXX Judges belongs to Barthélemy, who argued that the B-group is essentially a *kaige* text (*Les devanciers*, pp. 34–88).

Bodine extended Barthélemy’s work on Judges, noting further indicators of *kaige* within the B-group (*Greek Text*, pp. 11–66). He observed that the B-group used some quantitative equivalents which were only sparsely attested in other parts of the LXX influenced by *kaige*. This suggested that *kaige* in Judges should be partly distinguished from *kaige* elsewhere in LXX (*Greek Text*, pp. 67–91).

Having refined Barthélemy’s categorisation of the B-group, Bodine investigated the relation to it of AI, AII and AIII by means of a detailed study of variant readings in Judges 1–2, 10–11 and 17–18. His conclusions, which in general confirmed those of Soisalon-Soininen and Barthélemy, are set out in the following paragraphs (Bodine, *Greek Text*, pp. 93–183; cf. Billen, ‘Hexaplaric’).

AII (‘L’ in Bodine) most consistently represents the earliest form of LXX Judges (the ‘Old Greek’, hereafter OG) (*Greek Text*, pp. 134–35). This group diverges most often from MT, either alone, or with the support of another group; it is therefore the group least affected by *kaige* revision. It also has the closest agreement of all the groups with the Old Latin (an important witness to the OG).

AI represents a ‘full’ text which includes both obelised material (material marked by Origen in LXX as having no parallel in Hebrew) and asterisked material (in Hebrew with no parallel in his LXX text): that is, it has pluses both when they represent Origen’s LXX text and when they do not. The presence of the asterisked material (in 59 out of the 104 cases where the asterisk is attested in the textual tradition) marks out the text of AI as ‘primarily Hexaplaric’.

AIII (‘K’ in Bodine) is a mixed text which, though it clearly belongs with the A-groups and other witnesses over against the B-group, has the highest number of *kaige* readings of all the A-groups. It is also a ‘short’ text which tends to omit both obelised and asterisked material: it has minuses both when they represent Origen’s LXX text and when they do not.

In short, Rahlfs’s B text usually stands furthest from the OG and closest to MT (cf. § IV). Rahlfs’s A text stands closer to OG, but still contains many examples of *kaige* revision and Hexaplaric contamination (evidenced by the presence of doublets). The presence of *kaige* elements within the A-groups seems to be due partly to the fact that Origen’s base text, which lies behind many of the manuscripts in these groups, was already influenced by *kaige* (Bodine, pp. 136–40). The OG is most consistently represented by AII, particularly the subgroup g l n o w.

II. Time and Place of Composition

The Prologue to Sirach, though it does not mention Judges by name, implies that LXX Judges was in existence by the end of the second century B.C.E. Two features of LXX Judges may suggest that it was produced no earlier than the 160s B.C.E. (cf. *BGS*, pp. 86–98).

LXX Judges regularly translates פְּלִשְׁתִּים by ἄλλόφυλοι, in contrast to LXX Pentateuch and Joshua, which translate throughout by Φυλιστιμ (also occurring six times in Judges 10–14 in the B-group). In the books of Maccabees, ἄλλόφυλοι regularly denotes foreigners, particularly Greek-speakers, not Philistines. Harlé sees in the use of this term in Maccabees a response to the attempt by Antiochus IV to force hellenisation on the Jews. He suggests that the use of the same term to translate פְּלִשְׁתִּים in

Judges and 1–4 Reigns can be linked to the usage in Maccabees. If this argument is sound, it would date LXX Judges after 167 B.C.E. (*Bd'A* 7, p. 59).

Along similar lines, Fernández Marcos suggests that in 16.6-31, LXX transforms Samson from an entertainer into a victim of Philistine cruelty. At 16.25 the OG reading seems to introduce an element of violence not found in MT: ויקראו לשמשון...ויצחק לפניו becomes *καὶ ἐκάλεσαν τὸν Σαμψων...καὶ ἐνέπαιζον αὐτῷ καὶ ἐρράπιζον αὐτόν* ‘and they called Sampson...and were making fun of him and they were beating him’. At 16.27 OG has a similar deviation from MT: והראים בשחוק שמשון becomes *ἐμβλέποντες ἐμπαιζόμενον τὸν Σαμψων* ‘watching Sampson being made fun of’. These are not standard lexical equivalents. Fernández Marcos wonders whether the translator has introduced an allusion to Seleucid persecution in the early second century B.C.E., comparing 2 Maccabees 6–7.

Other evidence suggests a relative dating *vis-à-vis* other LXX books. Tov notes cases where the translator of Judges has apparently drawn on LXX Pentateuch. The translation of מספוא by *χόρτασμα* ‘fodder’ at 19.19 uses a lexical equivalence found at Gen. 24.25. The translation of בפרעות by *ἐν τῷ ἄρξασθαι ἀρχηγούς* ‘when the chiefs take the lead’ at 5.2 in the A-groups can be linked to the rendering of מראש פרעות אויב at Deut. 32.42 by *ἀπο κεφαλῆς ἀρχόντων ἐχθρῶν*. The translation of the same phrase at 5.2 in the B-group by *ἀπεκαλύφθη ἀποκάλυμμα* ‘an unveiling was unveiled’ can be linked to Num. 5.18, *καὶ ἀποκαλύψει* for ופרע (Tov, ‘Impact’). Barthélemy suggests that two readings of the B-group may have been influenced by LXX Pentateuch: *καὶ ἐξαπέστειλεν ἀφ’ ἑαυτοῦ πάντας τοὺς ἐφεστῶτας ἐπ’ αὐτόν* ‘and he sent all those who stood by him out from him’ (3.19; cf. Gen. 45.1); *ἐπιστρεφέτω καὶ ἐκχωρείτω* ‘let him turn round and leave’ (7.3; cf. Deut. 20.8; Barthélemy, *Critique Textuelle*, pp. 77, 94). It is in any case clear that the Pentateuch was the first part of the Bible to be translated into Greek.

Sipilä establishes a clear difference between Joshua and Judges as regards literalism vs. freedom in translation (*Between Literalness*, pp. 81, 166–67; cf. also *Bd'A* 7, pp. 35–38, where Harlé distinguishes LXX Judges from LXX Pentateuch and Joshua, seeing LXX Judges as representing ‘a new literalism’ which continues in the historical books following). The different renderings of Josh. 15.16/Judg. 1.12 and Josh.

15.9/Judg. 1.15 (MT being identical in each case) also suggest that LXX Joshua and Judges come from two different translators. But these points are not, properly, an argument for relative *dating*.

III. Language

The vocabulary of LXX Judges reflects that of standard Koine. It is difficult nonetheless with syntax to identify what is representative of the language (as described by Horrocks, *Greek*, pp. 106–108) and what arises from the translation technique. Thus, Thackeray classes Judges as one of the ‘literal or unintelligent versions’ (*Grammar*, p. 13). Voitila (‘La Septante’, p. 20) lists some features that reflect a Koine that is not as fully developed as in New Testament.

a. Idiom

There are many cases where a Hebrew word or idiom is rendered literally, producing unidiomatic Greek (see § IV). However, sometimes LXX Judges departs from its stock renderings. Thus occasionally LXX Judges translates ו by δέ and not καί (the usual rendering), giving an appropriate adversative nuance (e.g., 1.25; 7.8, A-groups; 15.13, A-groups; see Sipilä, pp. 35–41); at 19.30 the A-groups translate אלו...אל by οὔτε...οὔτε (B-group οὐκ...καὶ οὐκ), a ‘good idiomatic rendering’, which shows that the translator ‘must have realised that there were two disjunctive negative clauses in the *Vorlage*’ (*Between Literalness*, p. 49); sometimes two finite verbs in MT are translated by conjunctive participle and finite verb, e.g., 9.9, 11, 13, where the A-groups render והלכת...והחדתי as ἀφείσα...πορευθῶ (B-group ἀπολείψασα...πορεύσομαι) (*Between Literalness*, pp. 58–59); at 19.7 the A-groups translate וישב וילן by καὶ πάλιν ἠύλισθη, an ‘excellent free translation’ (*Between Literalness*, p. 69; compare 2.19, where a doublet has probably obscured a similar translation according to Schreiner, *Septuaginta-Massora*, p. 91); at 15.13 the A-groups translate לא כִּי־אָסַר נֶאֱסַר by οὐχί, ἀλλὰ δεσμῶ δῆσομέν σε, where ἀλλά well conveys the required sense. The translator clearly had a better command of Greek than usually emerges from his translation.

b. Lexical Innovations

In a section devoted to the vocabulary of LXX Judges, Harlé notes 49 words which occur nowhere else in LXX, though some of them occur elsewhere, such as *προστάς* ‘porch, portico’ (3.22, 23) and *λεκάνη* ‘dish, pot’ (5.25), both attested in papyri of the third century (*Bd’A*, pp. 56–57). Of these cases, 15 occur in the Song of Deborah (Judges 5). He further notes a number of lexical innovations: translations (sometimes transliterations) of particular Hebrew words used for the first time in LXX Judges, and taken up (particularly) in the translations of the later historical books (*Bd’A* 7, pp. 57–58): *σωτήρ* ‘saviour’ for מוֹשִׁיעַ in 3.9, 15; *κερατίνη* ‘horned’ for שׁוֹפֵר in 3.27; *ἀγαθύνω* for various forms of the root טוֹב used to mean ‘do good’ or ‘make glad [the heart]’ (16.25). Some of these innovations are compound words (see Tov, ‘Compound’) apparently coined out of a desire to translate a group of Hebrew words representing a single idea by a single Greek word: *ἀμφοτεροδέξιος* ‘ambidextrous’ for אֶטֶר יַד יְמִינוֹ in 3.15 and 20.16; *εὐρύχωρος* ‘wide’ for רַחֲבַת יָדַיִם in 18.10 (A-groups).

IV. Translation and Composition

LXX Judges usually represents a text-form identical to MT, though it may sometimes be based on a different *Vorlage* (e.g., 16.13-14; 19.2, A-group; 19.30, A-group).³ Occasionally it has sentences in a different order compared to MT (3.30–4.1; 20.26-28, B-group). Sometimes the translator apparently had a consonantal text identical to MT, but supplied different vowels (e.g., 18.25, where אֵל תִּשְׁמַע קוֹלְךָ is translated as *μὴ ἀκουσθήτω δὲ ἡ φωνή σου*, implying vocalisation of תִּשְׁמַע as Niphal, not Hiphil). Both Tov (‘Textual History’) and Fernández Marcos (‘Heros’) note cases where LXX Judges seems to have understood an Aramaic sense to Hebrew words. This phenomenon is, of course, not unique to Judges, representing the spoken language of the time.

3. This section builds upon Satterthwaite (NETS, pp. 195–200). A reference to particular manuscripts or manuscript groups (A-group, B-group, AI, AII, AIII) is always specified as such (e.g., 1.6, AI); references with no such indication are (with minor exceptions) common to both A- and B-groups. The letters A or B by themselves denote MSS Alexandrinus and Vaticanus respectively.

a. Word Order

In word order LXX Judges usually follows MT. Sipilä notes how the translation technique of LXX Judges displays ‘very narrow segmentation’ (*Between Literalness*, p. 211), a tendency to translate in small units (clause by clause and phrase by phrase), which would have affected the word order. An example is the translation of ו + verb vs. ו + non-verb at the beginning of clauses, an important distinction in Hebrew, but less important in Greek: LXX Judges usually follows MT word-order, producing a strained sentence structure: 9.24 (B-group) reads τοῦ ἐπαγαγεῖν τὴν ἀδικίαν τῶν ἐβδομήκοντα υἱῶν Ιεροβααλ καὶ τὰ αἵματα αὐτῶν τοῦ θεῖναι ἐπὶ Αβιμελεχ (glnow have the more natural word-order καὶ ἐπιθεῖναι τὸ αἶμα αὐτῶν; Soisalon-Soininen, *Textformen*, pp. 34–35).

b. Accuracy

LXX Judges generally conveys the sense of the Hebrew adequately. However, names and obscure words seem to have caused the translator problems (cf. Soisalon-Soininen, *Textformen*, pp. 26–31; *Bd’A*, pp. 38–39): at 1.15, מים גלת becomes λύτρωσιν ὕδατος ‘redemption of water’, as though גלת were related to לאג; at 4.11 דד-אלון בצענים becomes πρὸς δρυῶν ἀναπαυομένων ‘by Oak-of-the-Resters’ in the A-groups, as though צענים were related to אנש, and ἕως δρυὸς πλεονεκτούντων ‘as far away as Oak-of-the-Greedy’ in B-group, seemingly linking צענים with the root בצעב.

Judges 5, a poetic text containing many rare words, caused the translator more severe difficulties. At 5.8 the A-groups render יבחר אלהים חם שערים אדשים nonsensically as ἡρέτισαν θεοὺς καινοὺς ὡς ἄρτον κρίθινον ‘They chose new gods, like barley bread’. The reading of B-group, ἐξελέξαντο θεοὺς καινοὺς· τότε ἐπολέμησαν πόλεις ἀρχόντων ‘They chose new gods; then the cities of the rulers fought’, is somewhat closer to MT (on Judges 5 see Tov, ‘Textual History’).

Occasionally LXX Judges simply transliterates the Hebrew, perhaps sometimes because there was no obvious Greek equivalent: Βαλειμ (2.11), εφουδ (17.5), θεραφειν (18.14). Elsewhere transliteration was probably the translator’s last resort when faced with difficult Hebrew: μωσφαθαιμ (5.16, A-group); αμμαδαρωθ (5.22, AI); ζεμα καὶ ἀπόπτωμα (20.6, B; a doublet).

c. Conjunctions

LXX Judges is written in a form of Greek that, by the standards of most ancient Greek literature, is not fully idiomatic. Thus the almost universal rendering of the standard connective particle ι with $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$, only occasionally varied with other common Greek connective particles ($\delta\acute{\epsilon}$, $\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$, $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu$, $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$), produces what is ‘tolerable Greek in the microcontext’ but something that is ‘paratactic and monotonous style in the wider context’ (Sipilä, *Between Literalness*, p. 33).

Sipilä’s study of formulae frequent in Hebrew narrative, such as $\text{ויהי והיה, והנה, ועתה}$ yields similar conclusions (*Between Literalness*, pp. 82–107). LXX Judges with few exceptions renders these with quantitative equivalents, producing clumsy Greek. For example, at 3.18 $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota} \acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\tau\omicron \acute{\omega}\varsigma \sigma\upsilon\nu\epsilon\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\sigma\epsilon\nu \text{Αωδ προσφέρων τὰ δῶρα, καὶ ἐξάπεστειλεν τοὺς αἵροντας τὰ δῶρα}$, the expression $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota} \acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\tau\omicron$ is effectively redundant. See too 11.31 where the repetition of $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota} \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$ is awkward; and 13.3–4 where $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota} \nu\acute{\upsilon}\nu$ does not carry the sense of inference which וְעַתָּה has ($\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu$ would have been better, but LXX Judges never translates וְעַתָּה with $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu$).

Sipilä further notes the translator’s faulty use of genitive absolute clauses: $\text{αὐτῶν ὄντων παρὰ τῷ οἴκῳ Μιχα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐπέγνωσαν τὴν φωνήν}$ (18.3, AI and AII), where the subject of the participle is, contrary to normal usage, the same as the subject of ἐπέγνωσαν . ‘One may therefore conclude that he tried to use natural Greek idioms, but was not really successful in doing so’ (*Between Literalness*, pp. 64–67; quotation from p. 67).

d. Prepositions

Greek normally distinguishes $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ + accusative (‘into’) and $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ + dative (‘in/among’). Hebrew uses the preposition ב to mean either ‘into’ or ‘in/among’, depending on the context. LXX Judges regularly and indiscriminately translates ב in both senses by $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ + dative. See, for example, 1.3 $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota} \text{πορεύσομαι...ἐν τῷ κλήρῳ σου}$.

Hebrew repeats the preposition בין in phrases of the type ‘between X and Y’. LXX Judges translates such phrases word for word, producing translations such as $\text{ἀνὰ μέσον Παμα καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον Βαιθηλ}$ (4.5).

e. Particular Constructions

LXX Judges consistently reproduces in Greek constructions which are unattested or only rarely attested in other forms of Greek. Thus, though LXX Judges generally translates the relative particle אשר smoothly, its rendering of אשר clauses involving ‘relative resumption’ (where the clause ends with a word that picks up the antecedent) is far less idiomatic. At 18.6, אשר תלכו בה is rendered word for word as ἡ ὁδὸς ὑμῶν, καθ’ ἣν [ἐν ἣ, B-group] ὑμεῖς πορεύεσθε ἐν αὐτῇ.

The Hebrew infinitive absolute is used to reinforce a finite verb from the same root. LXX Judges translates such infinitives absolute either with a cognate noun in the dative (θανάτῳ ἀποθανούμεθα, 13.22) or with a participle (διδόντες δώσομεν, 8.25). Neither is good Greek.

Biblical Hebrew uses יס (Qal or Hiphil) followed by the infinitive construct of another verb to denote repeated action: e.g., ויפנו בני ישראל לטות in 3.12. LXX Judges translates this idiom literally, using προστίθημι followed by an infinitive: καὶ προσέθεντο οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ ποιῆσαι (3.12); οὐ προσθήσω τοῦ ἐξῆραι (2.21).

Hebrew can use איש (singular) in a distributive sense, e.g., ויש ברעהו (7.22). LXX Judges generally translates this idiom word for word: ἔθετο κύριος μάχαιραν ἀνδρὸς ἐν τῷ πλησίον αὐτοῦ (7.22). On four occasions, however, the A-groups translate more idiomatically, with ἕκαστος (2.6; 7.21; 9.49; at 21.25 ἀνὴρ ἕκαστος).

f. Particular Words and Phrases

There are many unidiomatic or odd translations in LXX Judges, behind which a particular Hebrew word or idiom may be recognised. Examples include οὐ διασκεδάσω τὴν διαθήκην μου (2.1); ἐν ἐμοί, κύριε (6.13, 15); οὐκ ἐποίησαν ἔλεος μετὰ τοῦ οἴκου Ἱεροβααλ (8.35); ἔρριψεν τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ἐξ ἐναντίας (9.17, AI, AIII, B-group); ἐξελεύσομαι ὡς ἄπαξ καὶ ἄπαξ (16.20, B-groups; A-groups have the more idiomatic ἐξελεύσομαι καὶ ποιήσω καθὼς αἰεὶ); καὶ ἔση [γενοῦ, B-group] ἡμῖν εἰς πατέρα καὶ εἰς ἱερέα (18.19).

After a survey of LXX Judges Soisalon-Soininen stated that ‘from the point of view of idiom, it would be fair to regard Judges as the weakest translation of the entire LXX’ (*Textformen*, p. 60, author’s translation).

Sipilä's comparative study of LXX Joshua and Judges, which also takes into account LXX Pentateuch, always places Judges at the more literal end of the spectrum (see the tables in *Between Literalness*, pp. 75, 90, 96, 101, 107, 166). Why, given that the translator is capable of producing idiomatic Greek (see § III), does he generally not do so? It may be that the translator deliberately produced a translation which would mirror its *Vorlage* closely, such that an informed reader could deduce the underlying Hebrew from it (cf. Satterthwaite, NETS, p. 199, and the 'interlinear' paradigm of NETS, pp. xiv–xv). But Sipilä's explanation is equally plausible: the usually clumsy Greek of LXX Judges is due less to a deliberate translation philosophy than to a combination of 'habit' and an 'easy' translation technique involving 'narrow segmentation', such that idiomatic renderings occur only rarely and unsystematically (*Between Literalness*, p. 207).

We should avoid sweeping characterisations, however. Fernández Marcos suggests that if we base our opinion of LXX Judges on the A-groups, particularly AII, it may seem a freer and more intelligent translation than when read in the B-text (Fernández Marcos, 'Heros', pp. 121–22). This can be seen in the following features: additions of subjects or complements (proper names, pronouns) intended to remove ambiguities; attempts to harmonise the data in different passages; the suppression of ambiguous or obscure passages (cf. Fernández Marcos, 'Hebrew', pp. 13–15; Soisalon-Soininen, *Textformen*, pp. 31–62).

Fernández Marcos illustrates these tendencies in Judges 13–16 ('Heros', pp. 123–25, 128), but his conclusions hold good throughout LXX Judges: all LXX groups, confronted with awkward-seeming Hebrew, sometimes display a 'smoothing' tendency, but the tendency is clearest in AII, as the following examples show (some of these are discussed in Barthélemy, *Critique Textuelle*).

At 3.19 all the LXX traditions try in different ways to fill the logical gap between what Eglon says (וַיֹּאמֶר הִס) and what follows (וַיֵּצְאוּ מֵעֵלָיו) (כל-הַעַמִּדִים עִלָּיו): why should a command to 'hush' be followed by the exit of Eglon's servants? B-group clarifies וַיֹּאמֶר הִס by translating καὶ εἶπεν Ἐγλωμ πρὸς αὐτόν Σιώπα, and translates the next clause (καὶ ἐξῆλθε στείλειν ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ πάντα τοὺς ἐφεστῶτας ἐπ' αὐτόν, as though the text read וַיֵּצְאוּ Hiphil), linking the two sentences by making Eglon the

subject of both. AII has *καὶ εἶπεν σιγαῖ καὶ εἶπεν πάντας ἐκ μεσοῦ γενέσθαι* (with minor variations), which leads well into the second sentence (*καὶ ἐξῆλθον ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ πάντες οἱ παραστήκοντες αὐτῷ*). Cf. 17.3-4, where AII similarly attempts to ‘straighten out’ a puzzling sequence of events.

At 10.8 MT describes the Ammonite oppression as taking place *בשנה שנה עשרה שנה*, in which ‘in that year’ apparently contradicts ‘eighteen years’. The manuscripts glnow contain no equivalent to *בשנה שנה*, removing the contradiction. The B-group removes the difficulty by using the vaguer expression *ἐν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκείνῳ*.

At 11.37 glnptvw render the puzzling phrase *וירדתי על-ההרים* more intelligibly as *καὶ ἐπιβήσομαι ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη* (AI, AIII, B-group *καὶ καταβήσομαι*).

At 18.19 the double *ἦ* in AII (*ἦ βελτιόν σοι εἶναι σε ἱερέα οἴκου ἀνδρὸς ἐνὸς ἢ γίνεσθαι σε ἱερέα φυλῆς καὶ συγγενείας ἐν Ἰσραηλ*) rightly indicates that the Danites are posing an alternative for the young Levite (other MSS have *μή*).

At the end of 20.40 AII translates MT *עלה כל-העיר השמימה* with *καὶ εἶδεν ἀναβαίνοντα τὸν καπνὸν τῆς πόλεως ἕως τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*. This is less literal but more intelligible than the majority reading *ἀνέβη συντέλεια τῆς πόλεως εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν* (*ἕως οὐρανοῦ*, B).

At 21.17 g n o p t v w paraphrase the words *ירשת פליטה לבנימן*, turning the sentence into a question, and translating *ירשת* twice: *πῶς ἔσται κληρὸς διασῶζόμενος τῷ Βενιαμιν εἰς κληρονομίαν*, presumably in order to clarify the terse and opaque Hebrew.

V. Key Text-Critical Issues

We have noted above cases where the rendering of LXX (especially AII) is more straightforward than MT. In these cases, however, LXX is not necessarily to be preferred to MT, which can often be defended as *lectio difficilior potiorque*. Barthélemy (*Critique Textuelle*) often argues to this effect (see, e.g., his comments on 20.42). Satterthwaite came to similar conclusions when examining a number of ‘pluses’ in AII and OL in Judges 20–21 (‘Septuagintal Pluses’): these pluses most likely arose as explanatory additions made to a text largely identical to MT in order to fill in gaps in the narrative; sometimes these additions are insightful and

alert to problematic features of the narrative in its MT form, but none of them is clearly to be preferred to MT, which in each case presents a less smooth but arguably more subtle text. Sternberg argued similarly in connection with 16.13-14: LXX is more immediately intelligible than the ‘elliptical’ MT, but should not on that basis be preferred (Sternberg, *Poetics*, pp. 372–73).

Fernández Marcos characterised AII as follows: ‘the Antiochene or Lucianic text does not reflect a translation as literal as that of B, but an expansive text full of small additions...in order to clarify the meaning, with frequent doublets and some freedom in the word order and rearrangement of the verse, along with some light stylistic corrections’. He argued, further, that ‘the Hebrew text known by the Greek translator of Judges was one only slightly different from the Masoretic text’ (‘Hebrew’, pp. 14–15). Satterthwaite’s conclusions on Judges 20–21 were broadly in line with this: the pluses in these chapters contain significant Hebraisms and thus probably originated as additions made in Hebrew to a Hebrew text. The question which of the characteristic features of AII arose as revisions made to a Greek text and which can be traced back to a Hebrew *Vorlage* (itself possibly a revision of a text-form close to MT) merits further study.

All this means that, while AII may be the most consistent witness to the OG of Judges, many of its most distinctive features may have to be discounted before we can use it in the text criticism of the Hebrew Bible. In contrast, the B-text, which has been revised towards MT and is thus furthest from OG, may often have arrived by this indirect route at a form of the text which more plausibly represents the original Hebrew!

VI. Ideology and Exegesis

There are a number of possible ‘theologising’ renderings in LXX (NETS, pp. 199–200): the treatment of angels (2.1; 6.11-24); 4.8, where in targumic style the LXX introduces a reference to an angel; 5.23, where A-groups avoid the suggestion that God may stand in need of human aid; 9.9, 13, where LXX avoids any polytheistic implications (contrast NRSV, ‘gods and mortals’). To this we may add: 1.22, where יהוה עמם becomes καὶ Ἰουδας μετ’ αὐτῶν in many A-MSS, perhaps to avoid associating God with the ambiguous events of 1.22-26; 3.1, where A-groups

translate יהוה הניח with ἀφῆκεν Ἰησοῦς, again perhaps to avoid linking God with Israelite shortcomings. In these two cases the B-group follows MT.

Theologising tendencies may also be present in texts relating to the Spirit of the Lord. At 6.34 most LXX MSS translate יהוה לְבוּשָׁה by καὶ πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐνεδυνάμωσεν ‘and a spirit of the Lord empowered’ (though glnruwx and OL translate MT literally with ἐνέδυσεν): ἐνεδυνάμωσεν could be an inner-Greek error, but it is noticeable that this translation safeguards divine transcendence in a way which is not true of the more concrete metaphor implied by ἐνέδυσεν. Note also the translation of לַפְעֻמוֹ (13.25) by συμπορεύεσθαι αὐτῷ (Bq συνεκπορεύεσθαι αὐτῷ), not a normal translation equivalent, and one perhaps chosen to avoid the suggestion that the Spirit comes violently on Samson. Similar arguments may apply to 14.6, 19 and 15.14 (Fernández Marcos, ‘Heros’, pp. 122–23).

VII. Reception History

A review of the reception history is provided by Harlé (*Bd’A* 7, pp. 43–46). There are no clear citations of Judges LXX in the New Testament: Heb. 11.32 simply refers to four of the judges by name.

In Josephus’s *Antiquities* (5.120–317, the section which retells Israel’s history in the judges period) Harlé notes about ten passages which seem to follow the reading of the A-groups (and sometimes AII alone) over against MT: he concludes that in this part of the *Antiquities* Josephus had before him not only a Hebrew text but also a Greek text similar to AII, perhaps originating in Antioch (Harlé, ‘Flavius Josèphe’; also *Bd’A* 7, p. 44). As he notes, this supports the view that AII is the best witness to the OG. There is only one reference in Philo to Judges, at *Conf. Ling.* 128–30, where Gideon’s threat to demolish the tower of Penuel (Judg. 8.8–9) is interpreted as illustrating the fate of all who seek refuge in false arguments which lead them away from God. Philo cites Judg. 8.9 in a form closest to that of AII.

Judges is not frequently cited or expounded by the church fathers, perhaps because it does not contain many examples of edifying behaviour. Origen’s *Homilies on Judges* covers Judg. 2.7–7.20. It is based on a form of LXX which Harlé describes as a pre-Hexaplaric version of A, but

sometimes Origen shows that he is aware of the reading of the Hebrew text as well (*Bd'A* 7, pp. 46, 101 [on 3.1] and 116 [on 5.10b]). Similarly, the *Quaestiones in Iudices* of Theodoret (fifth century C.E.) appears to be based on a Greek text largely identical to AII.

Bibliography

- Barthélemy, D., *Critique Textuelle de l'Ancien Testament*, I (OBO 50/1; Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982), pp. 73–136.
- Billen, A.V., 'The Hexaplaric Element in the LXX Version of Judges', *JTS* 43 (1942), pp. 1–19.
- 'The Old Latin Version of Judges', *JTS* 43 (1942), pp. 140–49.
- Bodine, W.R., *The Greek Text of Judges: Recensional Developments* (HSM 23; Chico: Scholars Press, 1980).
- Dines, J.M., *The Septuagint* (London: T&T Clark International, 2004).
- Fernández Marcos, N., 'The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Judges', in A. Schenker (ed.), *The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible* (SBLSCS 52; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003), pp. 3–16.
- 'Heros et victim: Samson dans la LXX', in J. Joosten and P. Le Moigne (eds.), *L'apport de la Septante aux études sur l'Antiquité* (Paris: Cerf, 2005), pp. 119–33.
- Harlé, P., 'Flavius Josèphe et la Septante des *Juges*', in G. Dorival and O. Munnich (eds.), *Selon Les Septante* (Festschrift M. Harl; Paris: Cerf, 1995), pp. 129–32.
- Harlé, P., with T. Roqueplo (eds.), *La Bible d'Alexandrie*. Vol. VII, *Les Juges* (Paris: Cerf, 1999).
- Horrocks, G.C., *Greek: A History of the Language and Its Speakers* (2nd ed.; Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010).
- Lindars, B., 'A Commentary on Greek Judges?', in C. Cox (ed.), *VI Congress of the International Organisation for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Jerusalem, 1986* (Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1987), pp. 167–200.
- Satterthwaite, P.E., 'Judges', in A. Pietersma and B.G. Wright (eds.), *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), pp. 195–238.
- 'Some Septuagintal Pluses in Judges 20 and 21', *BIOSCS* 24 (1991), pp. 25–35.
- Schreiner, J., *Septuaginta-Massora des Buches der Richter* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1957).
- Sipilä, S., *Between Literalness and Freedom: Translation Technique in the Septuagint of Joshua and Judges Regarding the Clause Connections Introduced by ו and כי* (Publications of the Finnish Exegetical Society 75; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999).

- Soisalon-Soininen, I., *Die Textformen der Septuaginta-Übersetzung des Richterbuches* (AASF Series B, vol. 72, 1; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1951).
- Sternberg, M., *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative: Ideological Literature and the Drama of Reading* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985).
- Tov, E., 'Compound Words in the LXX Representing Two or More Hebrew Words', *Biblica* 58 (1977), pp. 189–212.
- 'The Impact of the Septuagint Translation of the Torah on the Translation of the Other Books', in E. Tov (ed.), *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (VTSup 72; Leiden: Brill, 1999), pp. 183–94.
- 'The Textual History of the Song of Deborah in the A Text of the LXX', *VT* 28 (1978), pp. 224–32.
- Voitila, A., 'La Septante: un document linguistique de la koiné grecque antique?', in J. Joosten and P. Le Moigne (eds.), *L'apport de la Septante aux études sur l'Antiquité* (Paris: Cerf, 2005), pp. 17–35.

Ruth

Eberhard Bons

Editions

(a) Standard Greek Editions

Göttingen, vol. IV.3, *Ruth* (Quast, 2006).

Cambridge, vol. I.4, *Joshua, Judges and Ruth* (Brooke and McLean, 1917).

Rahlfs-Hanhart, vol. I, pp. 495–501.

Swete, vol. I, pp. 538–44.

(b) Other Greek Editions

Rahlfs, *Das Buch Ruth griechisch* (1922).

(c) Modern Translations

NETS (Knobloch, 2007), pp. 239–43.

LXX.D (Bons, 2009), pp. 294–99.

Bd'A 8 (Assan-Dhôte and Moatti-Fine, 2009).

La Biblia Griega, vol. II (Fernández Marcos *et al.*, 2011), pp. 171–86.

I. General Characteristics

The Greek translation of the book of Ruth for the most part follows its Hebrew *Vorlage* closely. It has affinities with the *kaige* tradition, and therefore is usually dated sometime after the earliest evidence for this tradition, namely the Minor Prophets Scroll from Naḥal Ḥever (see *Les devanciers*). Its translation technique does not permit much in the way of exegesis by the translator, but by close attention to the vocabulary and translation choices some sense of the translator's setting and theology may be gleaned.

II. Time and Place of Composition

LXX Ruth exhibits some stylistic peculiarities which have been cited in recent attempts at dating the text (*Les devanciers*, pp. 34, 47, 49, 69; *Bd'A* 8, pp. 29–32). In particular, certain Hebraising tendencies can be seen as typical evidence of the so-called *kaige* revision, that is a translation or revision activity that is usually attributed to Jewish scribes in Palestine. Distinctive among the translation features are the following:

- a) Hebrew שׂוֹאֵל with the meaning of ‘someone’ rendered by Greek ἀνὴρ ‘man’ (Ruth 3.14; 4.7);
- b) the conjunction וְ (1) rendered by καὶ γέ (1.5; 2.15, 21; 3.12; 4.10);
- c) the pronoun וְאֲנִי by (καὶ) ἐγώ (or καὶ ἐγώ) εἰμί (2.10; 3.9, 12; 4.4; differently 2.13; 3.13);
- d) the unusual construction in Ruth 4.4 of ἐγώ εἰμί ἀγχιστεύσω ‘I am the one, I will act as next of kin’ (NETS).

It used to be held that in the first century C.E. a number of biblical translations were revised to be brought more into line with their Hebrew source texts, as evidenced in the *kaige* layer identified by Thackeray in Kings (Thackeray, ‘Greek Translators’). New translations in the first century also displayed such tendencies, as seen in books such as Canticles and Ecclesiastes (see *Les devanciers*), and in the book under discussion here, Ruth. Some questions have now been raised as to how far such a theory can be maintained of a first-century Hebraising translation. First, given our present state of knowledge, it is difficult to offer more precise theories regarding the origins of LXX Ruth. It could derive from either Palestine, Alexandria, or even elsewhere (see Fernández Marcos, *Septuagint*, p. 152; Bons, ‘Le vocabulaire’, p. 163). Similarly, one could postulate an earlier dating for the *kaige* revision, because it is attested as early as the first century B.C.E.—at least for the Book of the Twelve (Fernández Marcos, *Septuagint*, p. 152; Kreuzer, ‘Übersetzung’, p. 112). Finally, it is questionable whether the text associated with the *kaige* revision represents the first Greek translation of the book of Ruth (*BGS*, p. 159), or whether at the time an older Greek version of the book was known but is now lost.

A critical edition of the text of LXX Ruth has been available since 2006, a volume which has become indispensable for research (Göttingen;

ed. U. Quast). Among the questions that require further investigation, the problem of the dating and the origin of the translation are prominent. This is particularly the case given the debate as to how far we can still speak of a *kaige* tradition at all (see Janz, ‘Second Book’). Each book that has been so categorised displays its own methods and variation in translation equivalents. Accordingly, each translation should be evaluated on its own terms. In the case of Ruth such evaluation can be divided into three sub-questions: Is it possible to identify an Egyptian milieu for LXX Ruth on the basis of the terminology, such as the terms from the semantic field of slave and slavery? What are the consequences of this question for the dating of the translation and its place within the origins and history of the LXX? How are the theological innovations and emphases in LXX Ruth situated within the wider context of contemporary Jewish theology?

III. Language

Since the Greek translation of Ruth for the most part closely follows its Hebrew *Vorlage*, the language displays interference from the source text and language. The influence of the Hebrew source on the translation is particularly evident in the areas of syntax, word order and use of prepositions. LXX Ruth can be described as typical translation-Greek (see Mussies, ‘Greek in Palestine’, pp. 1048–49; on Ruth see Bons, ‘Septuaginta-Version’, pp. 206–207; Ziegert, ‘Das Buch’, pp. 223–24; ‘Wiedergabe’), characterised by a range of phenomena. Understandably, parataxis is frequent, while by contrast subordinate clauses are rare (Ruth 1.13, 16; 2.9; 3.11). The genitive absolute and accusative with infinitive are entirely absent, while it is only in very rare instances that use is made of *participium coniunctum* where the Hebrew text has finite verbs (Ruth 1.18; 2.18; 4.15). For the most part there is a lack of particles. Exceptions are the particle $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$, particularly with change of case (see below § IV); $\delta\eta$, after requests (1.8, 11, etc.); and $\gamma\epsilon$ (§ IV). One may note in addition the adoption of nominal phrases from the Hebrew (1.16; differently 2.6, 10; 3.11); the construction $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\tau\omicron$ (+ optional parts of a sentence) + $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ + finite verb (1.1; 3.8); the rendition of the Hebrew verb with inf. abs. by a Greek verb with participle (2.16; similarly 2.11); the use of $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ after

forms of εἶναι (instead of the nominal, 4.15); pleonastic ἐκεῖ in a relative clause (1.7); the comparative with ὑπέρ (3.12, where a comparative form appears in the LXX as well; 4.15) as well as the possessive dative (1.2; 2.1). Furthermore, the typical biblical Greek formula of καί ἰδοὺ is a characteristic translation equivalent for Hebrew הנה[ו] (see 2.4, 13; 3.2; 4.1).

IV. Translation and Composition

It appears from the close correspondence of the Greek to its presumed Hebrew *Vorlage* that the Hebrew text probably corresponded for the most part to the consonantal text of the later MT. The tendency to translate the Hebrew text as literally as possible is evident in the literal reproduction of such phrases as יהוה לי וכה יוסי, ‘May the Lord do thus for me and thus may he add’ (1.17, Greek using προστιθῆμι). A Hebrew model also lies behind the expressions ποιέω ἔλεος μετά + gen. ‘to treat mercifully’ (1.8), ἐπαίρω τὴν φωνήν + gen. ‘raise the voice (in weeping)’ (1.9, 14), εὕρισκω χάριν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς + gen. ‘to find favour’ (2.2, 10, 13), and ἀποκαλύπτω τὸ οὖς + gen. ‘to tell (you)’ (4.4).

Nevertheless, the translation of Ruth is not a mere copy of the original source, but differs in several respects from the Hebrew text. It appears that the translator tried as best he could to render the text in the target language with as much clarity and intelligibility as possible, aiming to be systematic in his choice of renderings (see Bons, ‘Septuaginta-Version’, p. 221; Ziegert, ‘Das Buch’, pp. 234, 248). Two examples can be cited. First, especially when there was a change of subject he added a proper name to make it clear which person was speaking (1.15, 18; 2.14, 18). He also on several occasions highlighted the change of subject by the use of the particle δέ (1.16, 18) in places where the Hebrew employs a *waw*. Furthermore, at the beginnings of speeches he occasionally added an addressee to clarify who was who (e.g., 1.15; 3.15; 4.1; full surveys in Bons, ‘Septuaginta-Version’, pp. 208–209; Ziegert, ‘Das Buch’, pp. 227, 230–34). Minor additions can also be found in 1.14 (καὶ ἐπέστρεψεν εἰς τὸν λαὸν αὐτῆς ‘and she returned to her people’), 4.7 (καὶ τοῦτο τὸ δικαίωμα ‘and this was the statute’) and 4.8 (τὴν ἀγχιστεῖάν μου ‘my right of inheritance’). All these techniques serve to provide clarity and

understanding to a tight narrative and alleviate any difficulties for the reader. It is, however, impossible to decide whether the translator himself made the additions, or whether he already found them in a *Vorlage* that differed from the later MT (Quast, Göttingen, p. 125). The same is true for some minor omissions. Absent from the LXX are translations for ‘and it happened when they arrived in Bethlehem’ (1.19) and ‘hold it [the garment] out’ (3.15). The translator might well have felt that these formulations were redundant—in the case of 3.15 she does hold out her garment afterwards anyway—or they were already missing from his *Vorlage* (so Göttingen, p. 125). Alternatively, they were only added later in the proto-MT.

Second, when speaking of people, their functions and characteristics, the LXX tends to introduce distinctions that are foreign to the Hebrew text. Thus Ruth has *δύναμις* (3.11; 4.11), while Boaz has *ἰσχύς* (2.1) where the MT has the same noun in both cases (כח). Also striking is the vocabulary of the semantic field of service/slavery which is used in chs. 2–3 in the description of the subordinates of Boaz (see further Bons, ‘Le vocabulaire’). The MT uses six different nouns without apparently any logic to their use. The LXX translates these terms by a range of equivalents without aiming at a concordant translation. Instead, the translator through his very choice of words draws a precise differentiation between Ruth and the other women. Those women working in the field for Boaz are described as *κοράσια* ‘maids’ (2.8, 22, 23; 3.2). Ruth, however, is designated as a *νεᾶνις* ‘young lady’ (2.5) or as a *παῖς* ‘child/slave’ (2.6). However, she identifies herself as Boaz’s *δοῦλη* ‘slave’ (2.13; 3.9 *bis*); indeed she announces herself as being one of Boaz’s *παιδίσκαι* ‘young girls’ (2.13). This designation is not meaningless when 2.13 is read in the light of 4.12 (see below § VI).

As for legal terminology, the word *δικαίωμα* in 4.7 has no equivalent in the MT (see above). This *terminus technicus* in documentary papyri designates documents, especially contracts and legal texts, that have been legally certified (see Cadell, ‘Vocabulaire’, p. 214; Montevecchi, ‘La lingua’, p. 80). The LXX uses *δικαίωμα* for most rules of divine law (Exod. 15.25 and often), more rarely—as in the book of Ruth—for rules or customs of a human origin (see also 3 Kgdms 8.11).

V. Key Text-Critical Issues

In comparison with other books of the Septuagint, manuscripts and papyri containing, in part or in whole, the Greek text of the book of Ruth are relatively recent. Of the manuscripts found in Qumran and the surrounding area of the Judean desert none for Ruth are in Greek, and only four are in Hebrew (2QRuth^a = 2Q16, 2QRuth^b = 2Q17, 4QRuth^a = 4Q104; 4QRuth^b = 4Q105). However, these fragments do not seem to represent a Hebrew text that would confirm the limited number of variant readings of the LXX (see Bons, ‘Septuaginta-Version’; ‘Le vocabulaire’; *Bd’A* 8, pp. 34–35). At present the oldest text witnesses are the well-known leaves from St Catherine’s monastery on Sinai (fourth century C.E.; see Quast, Göttingen, p. 11) as well as Codices B (fourth century C.E.) and A (fifth century C.E.), which have preserved the text of the book of Ruth in its entirety. Codex B is regarded as ‘a principal witness for the old LXX text’ (so Quast, Göttingen, p. 19), since this manuscript proves to be unaffected by the subsequent revisions and has not been adjusted towards the MT, which would be typical of later revisions (see Göttingen, p. 19). Rahlfs draws a distinction between the revisions (*Das Buch Ruth*, pp. 15–18), differentiating between the Hexaplaric, the antiochene and one additional recension that he designated by the letter R. Already in antiquity the Greek text of the book of Ruth was translated into other languages of the Mediterranean region (Latin, Coptic, Syriac, etc.).

Since the Sixtine edition (1587), Ruth has been included in the critical editions of the LXX with Codex B as its basis. In his text edition of 1922 Rahlfs largely used Codex B as his base text (cf. *Das Buch Ruth*, pp. 18–19), as well as in the manual edition of the LXX from 1935. Quast (Göttingen) provides a critical text that corresponds largely with that of Rahlfs. The few deviations (Göttingen, pp. 132–36) have no impact on the understanding of the text (with the exception of 4.11, *ποίησαι*).

Differences between the LXX and MT have already been noted (§ IV), but it is not easy to determine whether they represent a differing *Vorlage* or are moments of exegesis and clarification on the part of the translator. In a translation that follows so faithfully its Hebrew source, representing syntactic and clausal elements of the Hebrew, it might seem unlikely that the translator would introduce whole phrases. Nevertheless, the translator also shows a degree of freedom and variation in his renderings,

indicating it could have been possible for him to innovate. The question therefore whether small additions and omissions are the work of a translator or result from a differing *Vorlage* must remain open.

VI. Ideology and Exegesis

The structure of LXX Ruth does not deviate from the Hebrew text as transmitted in the MT. The narrative sequences and passages remain unchanged in the translation, and yet at times the translator imparts his own understanding into the text. These are subtle changes since the translation technique does not allow much room for exegetical embellishment.

The reading in 1.15 of the ambiguous Hebrew (singular or plural ‘gods’) is given specification in identifying the gods, to whom Orpah returns, clearly in the plural (πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς αὐτῆς ‘to her gods’). Unlike her polytheistic sister-in-law Ruth endorses the God of her mother in the singular (‘your God my God’; 1.16; cf. 2.12). The God of Israel is nowhere explicitly referred to in the singular, but is referenced in the rare translation of the Hebrew divine title ‘Shaddai’ as ‘the sufficient one’ (ὁ ἰκανός, 1.20, 21). This divine title, elsewhere in Job 21.15; 31.2 and 4 Bar. 6.3, arises from the derivation of the Hebrew word on the basis of Aramaic יד + ש ‘which [is] sufficient’.

Three small deletions remove from the text elements that could perhaps be regarded as scandalous (for details see De Waard, ‘Translation Techniques’, pp. 511–12; Bons, ‘Septuaginta-Version’, pp. 213–15). Thus, no equivalent is given in Ruth 1.12 for הלילה ‘[still] in [that] night’, in the testimony that Naomi could have sons by any man. In 3.7 it is not stated Boaz had been drinking, in case he be accused of acting irresponsibly as a result of alcohol consumption. Furthermore, the translation at 3.7 is silent on whether Ruth ‘lay down’ or not—suspicion is avoided that Ruth provoked a sexual encounter with Boaz.

In the choice in 2.13 of the noun παιδισκη ‘young woman’ (also sharing the sense of ‘wife’) Ruth proleptically anticipates her adoption of the title that she only receives in 4.12 after her marriage to Boaz. As such a woman she is to fulfil the hope that remains unfulfilled since ch. 1: to give birth to offspring (see Bons, ‘Le vocabulaire’, pp. 161–62).

VII. Reception History

A detailed, and yet at the same time very free rewriting of the book of Ruth is offered by Flavius Josephus (*Ant.* 5.318-37). This dispensed with much of the dialogue and instead emphasised the obedience of Ruth towards her mother (5.329). Josephus explains that he recounted the story because he wanted to show God's capability, how God is able to elevate ordinary people to a great status and grant them a great reputation (5.337; for further details see also *Bd'A* 8, pp. 54–56), as he did to David, whose genealogy according to Ruth 4.18-22 makes Ruth a descendant. This same genealogical information is adopted by Mt. 1.5; Lk. 3.32 and read in the context of the familial line of Jesus. In Patristic literature, from the time of Hippolytus of Rome, certain aspects are emphasised, such as Ruth's non-Jewish ancestry, which is seen as a type for the church consisting of Jews and Gentiles. Ruth's non-Jewish origin and her voluntary subjecting to the law (see the paraphrase of 1.16 in the Targum) is likewise an important element in Rabbinic interpretation of the book. For a comprehensive analysis and gathering of sources for the reception history, see Fischer, *Rut*, pp. 95–111; Scaiola, *Rut*, pp. 229–40.

Bibliography

- Assan-Dhôte, I., and J. Moatti-Fine (eds.), *La Bible d'Alexandrie, vol. VIII: Ruth* (Paris: Cerf, 2009).
- Barthélemy, D., *Les devanciers d'Aquila. Première publication intégrale du texte des fragments du Dodécapropheton* (VTSup 10; Leiden: Brill, 1963).
- Bons, E., 'Die Septuaginta-Version des Buches Ruth', *BZ* 42 (1998), pp. 202–24.
- 'Le vocabulaire de la servitude dans la Septante du livre de Ruth', *JSJ* 33 (2002), pp. 153–63.
- Cadell, H., 'Vocabulaire de la législation ptolémaïque. Problème du sens de *dikaiôma* dans le Pentateuque', in G. Dorival and O. Munnich (eds.), *KATA TOYΣ O': Selon Les Septante* (Festschrift M. Harl; Paris: Cerf, 1995), pp. 207–21.
- Fernández Marcos, N., *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible* (Leiden: Brill, 2000).
- Fischer, I., *Rut: Übersetzt und ausgelegt* (HThKAT; Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 2001).
- Janz, T., 'The Second Book of Ezra and the "χαίε Group"', in B.A. Taylor (ed.), *IX Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Cambridge 1995* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), pp. 153–70.

- Kreuzer, S., 'Übersetzung–Revision–Überlieferung. Probleme und Aufgaben in den Geschichtsbüchern', in W. Kraus and M. Karrer (eds.), *Die Septuaginta–Texte, Theologien, Einflüsse* (WUNT 252; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), pp. 101–16.
- Montevecchi, O., 'La lingua dei papiri e quella della versione dei LXX: due realtà che si illuminano a vicenda', *Annali di scienze religiose* 1 (1996), pp. 71–80.
- Mussies, G., 'Greek in Palestine and the Diaspora', in S. Safrai and M. Stern (eds.), *The Jewish People in the First Century, Volume 2* (CRINT I/2; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1976), pp. 1040–64.
- Quast, U. (ed.), *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum, vol. IV.3: Ruth* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006).
- Rahlf's, A., *Das Buch Ruth griechisch, als Probe einer kritischen Handausgabe der Septuaginta* (Stuttgart: Privileg. Württ. Bibelanstalt, 1922).
- Studie über den griechischen Text des Buches Ruth* (MSU 3; Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1922).
- Scaiola, D., *Rut: Nuova versione, introduzione e commento* (Libri biblici 23; Milano: Paoline, 2009).
- Thackeray, H.S.J., 'The Greek Translators of the Four Books of Kings', *JTS* 8 (1907), pp. 262–78.
- Thornhill, R., 'The Greek Text of the Book of Ruth: A Grouping of Manuscripts according to Origin's Hexapla', *VT* 3 (1953), pp. 236–49.
- Turner, K.-J., 'A Study of Articulation in the Greek Ruth', *BIOSCS* 34 (2001), pp. 95–114.
- Waard, J. de, 'Translation Techniques Used by the Greek Translators of Ruth', *Bib* 54 (1973), pp. 499–515.
- Ziegert, C., 'δέ statt καί als textpragmatisch motivierte Wiedergabe des Waw consecutivum und copulativum in der Septuagintafassung des Buches Ruth', *BZ* 53 (2009), pp. 263–73.
- 'Das Buch Ruth in der Septuaginta als Modell einer integrativen Übersetzungstechnik', *Bib* 89 (2008), pp. 221–51.

1–2 Kingdoms (1–2 Samuel)

Philippe Hugo

Editions

(a) Standard Greek Editions

Göttingen (currently in preparation; *I Regnorum*, ed. Aejmelaeus and *II Regnorum*, ed. Hugo).

Cambridge, vol. II.1, *I and II Samuel* (Brooke, McLean, and Thackeray, 1927).

Rahlfs-Hanhart, vol. I, pp. 502–64, 565–622.¹

Swete, vol. I, pp. 545–610, 611–68.

(b) Other Greek Editions

Lucianic tradition, *El Texto Antioqueno*, vol. I (Fernández Marcos and Busto Saiz, 1989).

Majority text of 1 Kingdoms, *Lucianic Manuscripts*, vol. I (Taylor, 1992).

(c) Modern Translations

NETS (Taylor and McLean, 2007), pp. 244–70, 271–96.²

LXX.D (Meiser, 2009), pp. 302–34, 335–82.³

Bd'A 9.1 (Grillet and Lestienne, 1997).

La Biblia Griega, vol. II (Fernández Marcos *et al.*, 2011), pp. 187–312.

1. Mainly based on A and B, to which is added the testimony of Origen's recension (O: x [247] c and [376]) 1 and the Antiochene text (or 'Lucianic', L: b' b o c2 e2 [in the order 19 108 82 127 93]); note: abbreviations correspond to manuscripts in the edition of Brooke-McLean-Thackeray, the numbering in brackets is that of Rahlfs, *Verzeichnis* and Rahlfs-Fraenkel, *Verzeichnis*.

2. Based on Rahlfs-Hanhart; non-*kaige* sections trans. by Taylor, *kaige* by McLean.

3. In the *kaige* sections, one column is from Rahlfs-Hanhart (which is not, strictly speaking, *kaige*) and one from the edition by Fernández Marcos and Busto Saiz.

(d) Additional Comments

The main modern editions (up to the twentieth century) either predate the latest discoveries—principally those manuscripts of the Desert of Judah—which have shaped our understanding of the history of this text (see § V) or are limited to a particular textual tradition. The planned Göttingen edition will redress these shortcomings.

1–2 Kingdoms is attested in just over sixty manuscripts ranging in date from the fourth century (B and a few papyrus fragments) to the sixteenth century. It also receives indirect testimony in the daughter versions: Vetus Latina, Ethiopic, Armenian, Coptic, Georgian (cf. Piquer Torijano and Trebolle Barrera, ‘Septuagint Versions’, pp. 259–61) and Syro-Hexaplaric (Brock, *Recensions*, pp. 5–13) and by quotations in Greek and Latin Fathers.

I. General Characteristics

The title ‘(Books) of Kingdoms’, *Βασιλειῶν*, attested by the whole manuscript tradition, appears from the second century C.E. in the biblical canon lists of Melito of Sardis (*Βασιλειῶν τέσσερα*) and Origen (*Βασιλειῶν α’–δ’*; cf. Eusebius, *Hist.* 4.26; 6.25). It is probably Alexandrian and pre-Christian in origin, since Philo (ca. 20 B.C.E.–ca. 50 C.E.) already uses the nominative *Βασιλεῖαι* (Swete, *Intro.*, p. 215). Under this heading are four LXX books corresponding in the Jewish canon to the two books of Samuel and of Kings. 1–2 Kingdoms therefore reflect only one Hebrew book, as Origen himself recalls, quoted by Eusebius (*Hist.* 6.25): *Βασιλειῶν α’ β’, παρ’ αὐτοῖς ἓν, Σαμουήλ, ὁ θεόκλητος*, ‘(The books) of Kingdoms one and two are among them [the Hebrews] one book, Samuel “God’s elected”’. If the division into two books is ancient, it is probably not original. Its origin should be sought in the size of rolls that could not contain in one 1–2 Kingdoms (or 3–4 Kingdoms) (Bogaert, ‘Septante’, pp. 591 and 594). 1 Kingdoms ends with the death and burial of King Saul (1 Kgdms 31.13), which corresponds roughly to the physical half of the book of Samuel in the Masoretic tradition (1 Sam. 28.23). The second book recounts the whole of David’s reign over Judah and Israel. The vast majority of manuscript witnesses close 2 Kingdoms at the end of ch. 24, which is the end of the book of Samuel in the MT. However, the Antiochene text (*L*) places the end of 2 Kingdoms after the death of David in 1 Kgs 2.11 (Josephus also ends Book 7 of *Antiquities* with this

episode). This also corresponds to the end of the $\beta\gamma$ section of Kingdoms (2 Kgdms 10.2–3 Kgdms 2.11) in which the LXX majority tradition (represented by B) is identified by the *kaige* group. These clues may point to an old division (Thackeray, ‘Greek Translation’, pp. 265–67; *contra* Rahlfs, *Septuaginta-Studien*, pp. 548–49) or reflect an editorial tradition in the Antiochene text (Fernández Marcos and Busto Saiz, *El Texto Antioqueno*, p. xxxi).

Since the work of Thackeray (‘Greek Translation’; *Septuagint*), 1–4 Kingdoms are usually divided into five sections: α = 1 Kgdms; $\beta\beta$ = 2 Kgdms 1.1–11.1 (or 1.1–9.13 according to Shenkel, *Chronology*, pp. 113–20); $\beta\gamma$ = 2 Kgdms 11.2–3 Kgdms 2.11 (or from 2 Kgdms 10.1 according to Shenkel); $\gamma\gamma$ = 3 Kgdms 2.12–21.43; $\gamma\delta$ = 3 Kgdms 22–4 Kgdms. Thackeray identified in the majority LXX (represented by B) two different types of translation. He thought that the sections $\beta\gamma$ and $\gamma\delta$ were the work of a later translator. Barthélemy (*Les devanciers*) showed that it was not a separate translation of the remainder of the book but a hebraising revision which he called the *kaige* ‘group’ (see § V). Hence there are *kaige* and non-*kaige* sections, each having different linguistic features (cf. §§ III and IV).

II. Time and Place of Composition

We know little about the time and place of 1–2 Kingdoms (cf. *BGS*, pp. 83–125). A *terminus a quo* can be set with the translation of the Pentateuch (beginning of the third century B.C.E.) and a *terminus ante quem* with the appearance of the *kaige* recension (first century B.C.E.). Some external indices allow a little more precision, since Sirach (translated between 132 and 117 B.C.E) seems to cite 1 Kingdoms but does not know the translation of 2–4 Kingdoms. Some lexicographical criteria suggest that the translation of the Psalter (probably in the early second century B.C.E.) influenced 2 and 4 Kingdoms, while 1 and 3 Kingdoms precede it. We can therefore date the translation of 1–2 Kingdoms in the early second century B.C.E., with the translation of the first book perhaps circulating before the second. Moreover, we must, in all likelihood, locate the translation in Alexandria (Thackeray, *Septuagint*, pp. 9–28).

III. Language

In view of the great diversity of the Greek textual tradition of 1–2 Kingdoms, we must distinguish the specific language (a) of the original translation (OG) (b) of the *kaige* recension, and (c) of the Antiochene text (*L*).

a) The oldest layer is a translation in a highly literal style, probably one of the most literal of the Septuagint (Aejmelaeus, ‘Septuagint’). But despite the strong Semitic interference due to literalism, the language remains fundamentally Koine Greek (NETS, p. 245) (see § IV). A number of neologisms can be noted in the OG of 1–2 Kingdoms: ἐπακρόασις ‘obedience’ (1 Kgdms 15.22), ἀυλάρχης ‘chief of the court’ (2 Kgdms 8.18), κολλυρίζω ‘to bake’ (2 Kgdms 13.6, 8), παραζώνη ‘girdle’ (2 Kgdms 18.11), and ἐξηλιάζω ‘to hang in the sun’ (2 Kgdms 21.6, 9, 13) (cf. NETS, pp. 246 and 272; McLean attributes certain neologisms to the *kaige* layer that are actually attested by the OG).

b) The *kaige* recension (sections βγ) is a hebraising reversion of the OG towards the text type of the MT (see § V). The literalism apparent in the older layer is further reinforced by a more rigorous isomorphism. Following Thackeray, Barthélemy (*Les devanciers*), who identified this revision (Barthélemy, ‘Redécouverte’), highlighted several linguistic characteristics of the *kaige* group; it suffices here to mention the translations of וְ by καί γε ‘and’, אֲנִי by ἐγώ εἰμι ‘I am’, אִישׁ by ἀνὴρ ‘man’, אִין by οὐκ ἔστι ‘it is not’, יהוה צבאות by κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων ‘lord of forces’, מֵעַל by ἐπάνωθεν ‘from above’, and שׁוֹפָר by κερατίνη ‘made of horn’ (*Les devanciers*, pp. 31–80). For verbs there is the tendency to substitute the aorist for the historic present. Barthélemy’s observations have been developed and refined by Shenkel (*Chronology*, pp. 113–20), who has shown in particular that the revised section βγ began at 2 Kgdms 10.1. Other features of the revision were subsequently identified in Kingdoms by many authors (see the recent synthesis by McLean, NETS, pp. 271–76). Kreuzer formulated recently the hypothesis that the *kaige* recension corrected the use of articles—mainly suppressing them—by isomorphic correspondence to the proto-MT (Towards’; ‘Translation’). Notably McLean (NETS, p. 272) points to some neologisms in the βγ section that should probably be attributed to the *kaige* reviser:

παραβιβάζω ‘to put aside’ (2 Kgdms 12.13; 24.10), ἐπιστήριγμα ‘support’ (2 Kgdms 22.19), μονόζωνος ‘single girthed’ (2 Kgdms 22.30) and ἐξέλευσις ‘exodus’ (2 Kgdms 15.20).

c) Even though *L* is an important witness to the OG (see below § V), it is not free from minor corrections primarily on the linguistic level. Indeed, some scholars maintain that this ancient text underwent an editorial stage known as the ‘Lucianic’ (fourth century C.E.). This was characterised by grammatical and lexicographical corrections of an atticising nature, removing Semitisms, adding words or small explanatory phrases, and harmonising or clarifying the stories. While doublets are found throughout the textual tradition of Samuel, they are particularly numerous in *L*, which could have the tendency to explain the OG by an alternative translation or a transliteration. This primarily stylistic edition had probably the aim of adapting the text for public reading (cf. Brock, *Recensions*, pp. 297–99; Fernández Marcos and Busto Saiz, *El Texto Antioqueno*, pp. xxviii–xxxii; see the opposite view by Kreuzer, ‘Towards’; ‘Translation’).

IV. Translation and Composition

Even though a systematic study of the translation technique of OG 1–2 Kingdoms has not yet been undertaken, the very literal translation of the original has long been recognised (Aejmelaeus, ‘Septuagint’). More than in the regularity of lexical equivalences, this literalism is typified by a scrupulous respect for word order (Marquis, ‘Word Order’, pp. 64–65). Thus, the use of particles is dictated by the desire to match the word order in Hebrew (Lestienne, *Bd’A* 9.1, pp. 42–44; Aejmelaeus, ‘Septuagint’, pp. 128–33): for example, וְ is regularly translated by καί or ἔτι and not by γάρ; similarly ἵ is normally rendered by καί and not by δέ; we also find that the particle δὴ always translates אַ. Several grammatical features can also be noted, such as the low usage of *participium coniunctum* to match better the Hebrew syntax (Soisalon-Soininen, *Infinitive*, pp. 177–78; Aejmelaeus, ‘Septuagint’, pp. 133–34), but the very frequent use of the *genitive absolute* (Soisalon-Soininen, *Infinitive*, pp. 178–79; Aejmelaeus, ‘Septuagint’, p. 135). For verbs, the oldest layer (non-kaige) made frequent use of the historical present and of the indicative, while

the revisions tend to use the aorist (Thackeray, *Septuagint*, pp. 20–22; Barthélemy, *Les devanciers*, pp. 63–65; Aejmelaeus, ‘Septuagint’, p. 136; Voitila, ‘Use of Tenses’). The study of the translation of semi-prepositions also places Kingdoms among those books that more accurately represent its Hebrew parent text (Sollamo, *Rendering*, pp. 280–89).

It appears that 1 Kingdoms (section *a*) is more regular in the implementation of most of these features than the other books—whether revisions or recensions. This has led some to wonder if this section is not by a different hand from the translation of the following books (Kelly, ‘Septuagint Translators’; Muraoka, ‘Greek Texts’). Some find support for this hypothesis in the regularity of lexical equivalences in 1 Kingdoms, which does not continue in all of the four books (*Bd’A* 9.1, pp. 44–50). But, in our view, these arguments do not ultimately prove the existence of several translation layers in 1–2 Kingdoms.

Furthermore, *L* has linguistic features that are not typical of the Antiochene revision (see above § III.c), but possibly attest to the older layer: the specific use of tenses (e.g., historical present and perfect; Aejmelaeus, ‘Septuagint’, pp. 136, 138, 141) and the use (by adding or removing) of articles and some explanatory words (Kreuzer, ‘Towards’; ‘Translation’; *contra* Law and Kauhanen, ‘Methodological’). The task of text-criticism consists of distinguishing the ancient version from the Antiochene revision (§ V).

The highly literal character of the translation means that in cases where the Greek differs from the MT, the translation usually depends on a source different from the Hebrew proto-MT text (§ VI).

V. Key Text-Critical Issues

The text of 1–2 Kingdoms has seen a complex and eventful history. Its original form was successively subjected to revisions and recensions whose purpose, in addition to correction of errors and grammatical and stylistic improvements, was to make the Greek text conform to the Hebrew model that began to be established (from the first century B.C.E.), the proto-MT (or rabbinic) text. These successive recensions have resulted in a text that is distinct from the original translation. To this must be added the phenomenon of cross-contamination in the textual

traditions. Restoration of the OG is achieved by identifying the different revisions that the original translation underwent to establish as far as possible the original translation.

The latest research identifies three major recensions of Kingdoms: (a) *kaige* recension (first century B.C.E.) (b) the Origenic or Hexaplaric recension (first half of the third century C.E.); and (c) the recension known as the Lucianic or Antiochene (fourth century C.E.).

(a) The *kaige* recension or, more accurately, revision, was identified by Barthélemy in 1953 ('Redécouverte') and described in detail in 1963 (*Les devanciers*). Studying the Minor Prophets scroll found at Naḥal Ḥever in 1952 (8HevXIIgr, dated to the end of the first century B.C.E. by Parsons, 'Scripts') he was able to identify an ancient Jewish recension earlier than Aquila and with affinities to Theodotion. He called this the '*kaige* group'. Indeed, this text shares linguistic features with witnesses or other books of the Greek Bible, including some sections of the books of Kingdoms.⁴ Barthélemy demonstrated that the sections identified by Thackeray ('Greek Translation') were not a different translation but a hebraising revision of the same type as in the Minor Prophets scroll, marked by a desire for greater fidelity to the proto-MT (*Les devanciers*, pp. 91–143; 'Les problèmes'). He thus identified a number of linguistic features related to Palestinian rabbinic hermeneutics (cf. above § III.b). The study of the *kaige* revision in the βγ section therefore led Barthélemy to conclude that *L* was not affected by this recension and thus presented a text close to the OG (*Les devanciers*, pp. 139–43) (cf. below).

(b) The second recension of the text of Kingdoms comes from Origen (185–253/4), called the Origenic or Hexaplaric recension (Johnson, *Die hexaplarische Rezension*; Brock, *Recensions*). The authority of Origen led copyists and editors to use extensively his recension, now lost in Greek, in order to assimilate the LXX to MT. Neglect or misuse of his critical signs (obelisks and asterisks) in the subsequent transmission led to a progressive contamination throughout the manuscript tradition which became deeply eclectic. For Kingdoms, the most affected are

4. Besides βγ and γδ section of Kingdoms, one can classify in this group the translation of Lamentations, Song of Songs and Ruth, the recension of Judges (MSS *i r u a 2* and *B e f s z*), the Theodotion recension of Daniel, the Theodotion additions to Greek Job and those often anonymous to LXX Jeremiah, the Theodotion column in the Hexapla and the Quinta of Psalms (*Les devanciers*, p. 47).

manuscripts A x [247] c [376],⁵ which together form the Origenic, *O* (Johnson, *Die hexaplarische Rezension*, pp. 88–106). Other groups, such as minuscules d l p q t z [in the order 107 370 106 120 134 554, to which may be added today 44 74 610] and the catenae of patristic commentaries are also affected (Johnson, *Die hexaplarische Rezension*, pp. 107–10). Regarding *L*, it contains much assimilation to MT, equally attested by Origenic witnesses (Brock, *Recensions*, p. 171). It does not appear as an independent witness to the Hexaplaric recension. But it also presents assimilation of another order, either directly from other columns of the Hexapla—primarily Symmachus—or other revision activities. The nature of *L* must be analysed in more detail (see below). Finally, B and the related minuscules y a₂ [121 509] fared better in the face of Origenic contamination (Johnson, *Die hexaplarische Rezension*, pp. 53–54; Brock, *Recensions*, p. 171) and provide a window to a pre-Hexaplaric text close to OG, at least outside the *kaige* sections. We must mention one last witness to the Origenic recension, the Syro-Hexaplaric version, which is in the end the closest witness (cf. Law, ‘La version’; Liljeström, ‘Fragments’; Brock, *Recensions*, pp. 5–13).

(c) The third recension is the one traditionally attributed to the martyr Lucian of Antioch (ca. 250–311/2), the ‘Lucianic recension’ (*L*), today generally known as the Antiochene text (cf. Metzger, ‘Lucianic’; Fernández Marcos, *Septuagint*, pp. 223–38). For Kingdoms, it is represented by the manuscripts b’ b o c₂ e₂ [in the order 19 108 82 127 93] and by quotations in the Antiochene fathers, especially Theodoret of Cyrus (ed. Fernández Marcos and Busto Saiz). If *L* has to be situated in the fourth century C.E. it actually rests on a very ancient textual basis (called the proto-Lucianic text) which probably separated from the mainstream of the LXX in the first century C.E. (Brock, *Recensions*, p. 299), and was attributed to the apocryphal authority of Lucian (Bathélemy, ‘Les problèmes’, pp. 243–54). *L* in fact presents many affinities with the *Vetus Latina* (end of second century C.E.) (Fischer, ‘Lukian-Lesarten’; Rahlfs, *Septuaginta-Studien*, pp. 138–61). Similarly, it appears that Josephus in the first century used a text containing the specific characteristics of *L* (Mez, *Die Bibel*) (see below § V). The Armenian and

5. The letters correspond to manuscripts according to the Cambridge edition and numbers to Rahlfs’s edition and Göttingen.

Georgian versions also show some affinity with *L* (Piquer *et al.*, ‘Septuagint Versions’). The evidence of the existence of an *L* text-type prior to the fourth century is further confirmed by the Samuel fragments from Qumran (ca. 50–25 B.C.E.; Cross *et al.*, DJD XVII): it is indeed not uncommon to find readings shared between *L*, *Vetus Latina*, Chronicles, 4QSam^a, and Josephus against MT and the LXX (see Cross, ‘History’, pp. 292–97; Ulrich, *Qumran Text*, pp. 257–59; ‘Old Latin’). These facts are a confirmation of the existence of the *kaige*-recension as well as the antiquity of the *L* text-type (Herbert, ‘Kaige Recension’). The affinity between *L* and 4QSam^a led Cross to explain the proto-Lucianic text as a recension of the OG based on a Hebrew parent text similar to 4QSam^a (Cross, ‘History’, pp. 295–96; Ulrich, *Qumran Text*, p. 258). On the contrary Barthélemy showed that the Antiochene text does not have the specificity of a recension, one tending to greater conformity to the Hebrew model, although it has suffered very early proto-Lucianic revisions of a hebraising and grecaising nature, pre-Hexaplaric and non-*kaige* (Barthélemy, ‘Les problèmes’, pp. 220–25). It seems therefore preferable to consider the proto-Lucianic as one sharing a close textual affinity with OG (*Les devanciers*, pp. 139–43; Tov, ‘Lucian’, p. 110). Other scholars have argued against Barthélemy that *L* attests to a large editorial layer of stylistic and grammatical revision, which dates from the fourth century C.E. (Brock, ‘*Lucian redivivus*’, p. 180; Fernández Marcos, *Septuagint*, pp. 235–36; see above § III.c).

During the last decades the debate concerning the nature of the Antiochene text has not reached a consensus. Some scholars have emphasised the editorial and secondary features of *L* (Fernández Marcos, ‘Lucinaic Text’, pp. 172–74; Taylor, *Lucianic Manuscripts*, vol. II, pp. 127–28). Very recent study tends to consider the agreements between the so-called proto-Lucianic witnesses (*Vetus latina*, Josephus, Chronicles, 4QSam^a) and *L* as less significant than has often been assumed (Kauhanen, *Proto-Lucianic Problem*; Saley, ‘Greek Lucianic’; ‘Proto-Lucian’). In contrast, Kreuzer recently reassessed the features of the Antiochene Tradition, such as the use of articles (Kreuzer, ‘From “Old Greek” to the Recension’; ‘Towards’; ‘Translation and Recensions’; ‘Textformen’). He concludes that *L* is basically the nearest witness to OG. But his conclusion has been challenged (Law and Kauhanen, ‘Methodological Remarks’).

In conclusion, recent research seems to confirm—though somewhat cautiously—Barthélemy’s hypothesis: the best access to the OG 1–2 Kingdoms is provided by B (with the manuscripts $y a_2$ [121 509]) outside the *kaige* sections—although it is also subject to ancient corrections (Aejmelaeus, ‘Kingdom’)—and in those sections of *L* which are free of the *kaige*-revision. For the entire book, *L* provides ancient material, insofar as we can extract it from its layers of revisions and recensions. We have to emphasise caution in assessing the Antiochene readings and avoid any tendency to simplify or generalise their textual complexity (Hugo, ‘Antiochenische “Mischung”’). Nevertheless, for the identification of this old layer of *L*, we must emphasise the importance of the daughter versions, especially *Vetus Latina*, the Armenian version, and the Georgian version (Piquer *et al.*, ‘Septuagint Versions’, pp. 259–61). The affinity between *L* and these other versions could open a pathway to the OG.

VI. Ideology and Exegesis

The OG of 1–2 Kingdoms displays many notable features different from the MT, although most current research suggests that these readings are attributable to the Hebrew *Vorlage* (see above § IV). Before the discoveries at Qumran, scholars who argued for a significant interpretative activity on the part of the translator (Gehman, ‘Exegetical’; Wevers, ‘Study’) tended to underestimate his fidelity to the Hebrew parent text. While some of these readings obviously arise from copying errors in the textual transmission, many of them are deliberate Hebrew variants modifying the literary and theological substance of the story (Hugo, ‘Text History’).

The first well-known passage where the Greek differs from the MT is the story of Hannah in 1 Kingdoms 1–2, where 4QSam^a also offers a separate textual form. The portrayal of Hannah, her participation in the cult, her prophetic traits and her vow to the Lord, her marginally more active role than her husband Elkanah in the story, and the judgement against the son of Eli are formulated in different ways in the three text witnesses. They attest to three editions of the story that would have entailed each correcting their common source (cf. Walters, ‘Hannah’; Tov, ‘Different’; Hutzli, *Erzählung*; Aejmelaeus, ‘Hannah’s Psalm’).

In the story of David and Goliath (1 Kingdoms 17–18), the MT has a story approximately 45% longer than OG, not to mention the variants in their shared sections. The question is whether the LXX is a shortened version, removing some tension or repetitions (Pisano, *Additions*; Barthélemy and Gooding, *Story*), or if the MT is the combination of two existing stories (Lust-Tov, *Story*; Treballe Barrera, ‘Story’; Lust, ‘David’; Pisano, ‘Alcune osservazioni’), or if the Masoretic form is the result of a genetic literary development from the short form (Auld and Ho, ‘Making’). Nevertheless, the two forms provide specific details in the portrait of David, a young shepherd and valiant warrior, and of Saul and their confrontation.

In addition to these two famous passages the LXX attests a large number of detailed variants, ‘pluses’, ‘minuses’, and doublets. Overall, 1–2 Kingdoms has a longer text than the MT, although the MT also contains elements missing from the LXX. The question is how to determine the origin of these differences. Some argue that MT, considered particularly corrupt, has undergone many haplographies (Gordon, ‘Problem’), while others believe that the *Vorlage* of the LXX (or occasionally the translator) has rather tended to clarify, harmonise and remove difficulties of his source text (Barthélemy, ‘La qualité’; Pisano *Additions*). In the ‘pluses’ evidenced by 1–2 Kingdoms, there are many doublets: their origins lie in revisions or recensions (e.g., *L*) which juxtapose the older LXX to readings revised in line with MT, or they belong to the OG or even his Hebrew substrate (Barthélemy, ‘Les problèmes’, pp. 221–23; Pisano, *Additions*, pp. 119–56; Brock, *Recensions*, pp. 158–66; *Bd’A* 9.1, pp. 53–57). All these phenomena (additions, deletions, harmonisations, or errors) can be attested alternately by the LXX or MT. However, in recent decades a growing stream of research tends to consider a large number of differences between the MT and the Hebrew source of the LXX as intentional, reflecting a literary and theological endeavour. The passages from 1 Samuel 1–2 and 17–18 are therefore not isolated cases of a double tradition or edition. This shows that these textual phenomena are at the intersection of the literary (composition) and textual (transmission) history of the books of Samuel.

A first indication of separate ‘editorial’ projects appears in the differences in divisions and connections between pericopes in 1 Kingdoms 1–4 (Treballe Barrera, ‘Samuel/Kings’, pp. 99–100; Treballe Barrera,

‘Textual Criticism’). Then, in the story of the ark (2 Samuel 6), the LXX seems to offer an older literary form (partially shared with 1 Chronicles 13) and the MT an editorial revision (Rezetko, *Source*; Hugo, ‘Die Septuaginta’; Hutzli, ‘Theologische’, pp. 230–34). Throughout the book there are also significant differences in the portrait of David: in many cases the MT seems to reflect an ideological correction in favour of the King (Walters, ‘Childless Michal’; Lust, ‘David’; Hutzli, ‘Mögliche Retuschen’; Schenker, ‘Verheissung’; Hugo, ‘Abner’; ‘Morde’; ‘King’s Return’; ‘Unique Messiah’). A final group of important differences appears in the religious themes of monotheism, cultic practices, and the centrality of the Temple: while we may observe occasional corrections in the LXX (Hutzli, ‘Theologische’) broad theological revisions seem to have affected the proto-MT (Lust, ‘David’; Schenker, ‘Verheissung’; Schenker, ‘Textverderbnis’; Hugo, ‘L’archéologie’; Hutzli, ‘Theologische’).

All in all, 1–2 Kingdoms provides likely access in many aspects to an older literary form of a proto-Masoretic text of 1–2 Samuel. Further research is to be expected in this field at the crossroads between literary and textual history.

VII. Reception History

Textual multiplicity evidenced by the books of Samuel at the turn of our era (see above §§ V and VI) is clearly reflected in the ancient reception of these books. It is not always easy to determine the nature of the biblical sources that were used by ancient Jewish authors. In the *Biblical Antiquities* by Pseudo-Philo, surviving only in a Latin version of the second or third century (Harrington, ‘Biblical Text’), the account corresponding to 1 Samuel attests to a close textual type of the Hebrew *Vorlage* of 1 Kingdoms (or *L*). The Greek translation behind the Latin itself seems to have had similar characteristics to the *kaige*-Theodotion tradition (Bogaert, ‘Luc’, pp. 247–48).

Josephus, in books 6 and 7 of *Antiquities* that tell the historiography of 1–2 Samuel, often reflects readings attested in the LXX (esp. *L*), 4QSam^a, Chronicles, or even the *Biblical Antiquities* (see § V.c above). While Mez (*Bibel*) and Thackeray (in Brooke-McLean, p. ix) already believed that the main biblical source for Josephus was *L*, Ulrich (*Qumran Text*;

‘Josephus’ Biblical Text’) argues that he was using ‘continuously and predominantly’ a Greek text—not Hebrew—of the same text type as 4QSam^a, namely a ‘proto-Lucianic’ Greek version. Conversely, Nodet recently published the surprising—and ultimately unlikely—hypothesis that the account of Josephus is the first Greek version of the history of 1–2 Samuel based on an official Hebrew text (from the ‘Jerusalem Archives’) close to 4QSam^a and thus predating the translation of Kingdoms (Nodet, ‘Josephus’). The middle way (Brock, *Recensions*, p. 210; Feldman *Interpretation*, pp. 32–34) so far still seems to be the most sensible: Josephus had various different sources in Hebrew (proto-MT, perhaps the *Vorlage* of the LXX, or even a text close to 4QSam^a), Greek (OG and/or proto-L) and Aramaic (targumic tradition) and used them dependent on the direction he wanted to give the story. The question is far from resolved.

The New Testament makes little use of 1–2 Kingdoms in comparison to the Pentateuch, the Psalms, and the Prophets. Besides a number of allusions that are not always easy to discern, there are some clear citations. For example, in Paul’s speech at Antioch recalling the beginnings of the monarchy (Acts 13.21) and the election of David (v. 22), the author of Acts explicitly cites 1 Kgdms 13.14 along with Ps 88(89).21 to trace the portrait of David. In the next verse (Acts 13.23), the ‘seed of David’ from which arose Jesus the Saviour of Israel echoes the Messianic promise of 2 Kgdms 7.12 and 22.51. The rest of the promise of the divine election of the son of David in 2 Kgdms 7.14 is cited in Heb. 1.5, with reference to the Son of God, and in Acts 21.7 to describe the ‘conqueror’ receiving divine adoption. In Rom. 15.9, in the midst of an exhortation to brotherly acceptance, Paul explicitly cites the hymn of 2 Sam. 22.50 (or Ps. 17[18].49). Finally, note that beyond quotations and allusions, many images, words, or recurring scenes of the New Testament find their roots in 1–2 Samuel and 1–2 Kingdoms (see Lefebvre, *Livres*).

The Greek patristic tradition reflects the reception of 1–2 Kingdoms in biblical commentaries, sermons and theological treatises. Besides Hannah, Samuel and Nathan, the character of David is prominent in the theology of the Church Fathers, who develop a typology of King David, a figure of Christ (cf. Meloni, ‘David’). Besides the occasional quotations scattered throughout patristic literature, a number of works specifically dedicated to passages from 1–2 Kingdoms are encountered.

Hippolytus of Rome (170–235) is the author of a treatise on David and Goliath which survives only in Armenian fragments and a Georgian version. David, priest, prophet and king, appears to be a foreshadowing of Christ's victory over evil (Goliath). More is known about the *Homilies on Samuel* by Origen (185–253/4), including the story of Hannah in 1 Kingdoms 1–2, which is available only in Latin, and another more famous story—the only one that is complete in Greek—the witch of Endor (1 Kgdms 28.2–25). This biblical passage—which raises the question of magic and demons, the fate of souls before the resurrection of Christ and prophecy—has had some success among the fathers since Origen's position was challenged by Eustathius of Antioch (late third century–338) and later by Gregory of Nyssa (ca. 331/340–ca. 395). Three *Homilies on David and Saul* by John Chrysostom (344/349/354–407) still survive, along with five Homilies on Hannah (PG 54.675–708), which are exhortations to imitate these biblical characters in virtuous life and personal effort. Another type of commentary found is the *Quaestiones in Reges et Paralipomena* by Theodoret of Cyrus (ca. 393–ca. 460) (ed. Fernández Marcos and Busto Saiz) since this is a treaty arranged as questions and answers on a variety of difficult passages, on the level both of the text and of the meaning (literal, figurative or typological). Citing the biblical lemma according to the Antiochene text (*L*), this work is an important witness to the history of the text of Kingdoms (see above § V.c). From the sixth century there appears a new form of interpretation of Scripture as selected quotations from the Fathers following the biblical text verse by verse, called *catenae*. In *catenae* for Kingdoms one finds fragments of many commentaries by the fathers, such as Diodorus of Tarsus (330–393/394), Theodore of Mopsuestia (ca. 352–428) and Severus of Antioch (ca. 465–538). The *catena* tradition is valuable for both patristic commentaries and for the biblical lemmas themselves.

The Latin fathers, through the *Vetus latina* (Bogaert, 'Les bibles'), also attest to the reception of the books of Kingdoms. Ambrose (340–397) is the author of the *Apology of David*, which is essentially a commentary on the *Miserere* (Ps. 50[51]). The bishop of Milan seeks to excuse the sin of the King, stressing his repentance (2 Kgdms 11–12), and made this story the figure of the mystery of salvation in Christ. Saint Augustine (354–430) cites Kingdoms mainly in the XVII and XVIII

books of the *City of God* (cf. La Bannardière, ‘Les livres’). The figure of David, a type of the royal and priestly Christ, also occupies a central place in the Bishop of Hippo.

In the Syriac tradition finally, the *Book of Samuel* of Jacob of Edessa (ca. 633–708) (ed. and trans. Salvesen 1999) is also an interesting indicator of the textual influence of Kingdoms. Indeed, in the version based on the text of the Peshitta, Jacob introduced many variants from the LXX, especially the Antiochene text (*L*), and also has a slight Hexaplaric influence direct from the Greek Hexaplaric tradition and perhaps from the Syro-hexapla (see Saley, *Samuel Manuscript*). It is testimony to the eclecticism that characterises the transmission of the Greek Bible.

Bibliography

- Aejmelaeus, A., ‘Hannah’s Psalm in 4QSam^a’, in P. Hugo and A. Schenker (eds.), *Archaeology and the Books of Samuel: The Entangling of the Textual and Literary History* (VTSup 132; Leiden: Brill, 2010), pp. 23–37.
- ‘A Kingdom at Stake: Reconstructing the Old Greek: Deconstructing the *Textus Receptus*’, in A. Voitila and J. Jokiranta (eds.), *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls* (Festschrift R. Sollamo; JSJSup 126; Leiden: Brill, 2008), pp. 353–66.
- ‘The Septuagint of 1 Samuel’, in *On the Trail of the Septuagint Translators* (2nd ed.; CBET 50; Leuven: Peeters, 2007), pp. 123–41.
- Auld, G., and C.Y.S. Ho, ‘The Making of David and Goliath’, *JSOT* 56 (1992), pp. 19–39.
- Barthélemy, D., ‘Les problèmes textuels de 2 Sam 11,2–1 Rois 2,11 reconsidérés à la lumière de certaines critiques des *Devanciers d’Aquila*’, in *Études d’histoire du texte de l’Ancien Testament* (OBO 21; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978), pp. 218–54.
- ‘La qualité du Texte Massorétique de Samuel’, in E. Tov (ed.), *The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Samuel* (Jerusalem: Academion, 1980), pp. 1–44.
- ‘Redécouverte d’un chaînon manquant de l’histoire de la Septante’, *RB* 60 (1953), pp. 18–29.
- Barthélemy, D., D.W. Gooding, J. Lust and E. Tov, *The Story of David and Goliath: Textual and Literary Criticism* (OBO 73; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986).
- Bogaert, P.-M., ‘Les bibles d’Augustin’, *RTL* 37 (2006), pp. 513–31.
- ‘Luc et les Écritures dans l’Évangile de l’enfance à la lumière des *Antiquités bibliques*’, in C.M. Tuckett (ed.), *The Scriptures in the Gospels* (BETL 131; Leuven: Peeters, 1997), pp. 243–70.
- ‘Septante et versions grecques’, *DBS* 12 (1993), pp. 590–601.

- Brock, S., 'Lucian redivivus: Some Reflections on Barthélemy's *Les devanciers d'Aquila*', in F.L. Cross (ed.), *Studia Evangelica*, vol. V (TU 103; Berlin: Akademischer Verlag, 1968), pp. 176–81.
- The Recensions of the Septuaginta Version of I Samuel* (Quaderni di Henoch 9; Torino: Zamorani, 1996) [originally Ph.D. dissertation, Oxford University, 1966].
- Cross, F.M., 'The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of Discoveries in the Judaean Desert', *HTR* 57 (1964), pp. 281–99.
- Cross, F.M., D.W. Parry, R.J. Saley and U. Ulrich (eds.), *Qumran Cave 4, XII. 1-2 Samuel* (DJD XVII; Oxford: Clarendon, 2005).
- Feldman, L.H., *Josephus's Interpretation of the Bible* (Hellenistic Culture and Society 27; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998).
- Fernández Marcos, N., 'The Lucianic Text in the Books of Kingdoms: From Lagarde to the Textual Pluralism', in A. Pietersma and C. Cox (eds.), *De Septuaginta* (Festschrift Wevers; Mississauga: Benben, 1984), pp. 161–74.
- Scribes and Translators: Septuagint and Old Latin in the Book of Kings* (VTSup 54; Leiden: Brill, 1994).
- The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Versions of the Bible* (Leiden: Brill, 2000).
- Fernández Marcos, N., and J.R. Busto Saiz, *El Texto Antioqueno de la Biblia Griega. I. 1-2 Samuel* (TECC 50; Madrid: CSIC, 1989).
- Fernández Marcos, N., and J.R. Busto Saiz (eds.), *Theodreti Cyrensis Quaestiones in Reges et Paralipomena* (TECC 32; Madrid: CSIC, 1984).
- Fischer, B., 'Lukian-Lesarten in der Vetus Latina der vier Königsbücher', in A. Metzinger (ed.), *Miscellanea Biblica et Orientalia A. Miller oblata* (Studia Anselmiana 27-28; Rome: Orbis Catholicus, 1951), pp. 169–77.
- Gehman, H.S., 'Exegetical Methods Employed by the Greek Translator of I Samuel', *JAOS* 70 (1950), pp. 292–96.
- Gordon, R.P., 'The Problem of Haplography in 1 and 2 Samuel', in G.J. Brooke and B. Lindars (eds.), *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings* (SBLSCS 33; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), pp. 131–58.
- Grillet, B., and M. Lestienne (eds.), *La Bible d'Alexandrie. Vol. IX.1, Premier Livre des Règnes* (Paris: Cerf, 1997).
- Harrington, D.J., 'The Biblical Text of Pseudo-Philo's *Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum*', *CBQ* 33 (1971), pp. 1–17.
- Herbert, E.D., 'The Kaige Recension of Samuel: Light From 4QSam^a', in E.D. Herbert and E. Tov (eds.), *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries* (London: The British Library, 2002), pp. 197–208.
- Hugo, P., 'Abner der Königsmacher versus David den gesalbten König (2 Sam 3,21.39). Die Charakterisierung Abners und Davids als Merkmale der literarischen Abweichung zwischen dem masoretischen Text und der Septuaginta', in M. Karrer and W. Kraus (eds.), *Die Septuaginta: Texte, Theologien und Einflüsse* (WUNT 252; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), pp. 489–505.

- ‘Die antiochenische “Mischung”. L zwischen Altem und Neuem in 2 Samuel’, in S. Kreuzer and M. Sigismund (eds.), *Der Antiochenische Text der Septuaginta in seiner Bezeugung und seiner Bedeutung* (DSI 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013), pp. 109–32.
 - ‘L’archéologie textuelle du Temple de Jérusalem. Étude textuelle et littéraire du motif théologique du Temple en 2 Samuel’, in P. Hugo and A. Schenker (eds.), *Archaeology of the Books of Samuel: The Entangling of the Textual and Literary History* (VTSup 132; Leiden: Brill, 2010), pp. 161–212.
 - ‘The King’s Return (2 Sam 19,10-16): Contrasting Characterizations of David, Israel and Juda in the *Old Editions*’, in H. Ausloos, B. Lemmelijn and J. Trebelle Barrera (eds.), *After Qumran: Old and New Editions of Biblical Texts: The Historical Books* (BETL 246; Leuven: Peeters, 2012), pp. 95–118.
 - ‘Die Morde an Abner und Amasa. Literarische Dimensionen textlicher Abweichungen zwischen dem Massoretischen Text und der Septuaginta in der David-Geschichte?’, in W. Dietrich (ed.), *Seitenblicke. Nebenfiguren im zweiten Samuelbuch* (OBO 249; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), pp. 24–52.
 - ‘Die Septuaginta in der Textgeschichte der Samuelbücher. Methodologische Prinzipien am Beispiel von 2Sam 6,1-3’, in M. Karrer and W. Kraus (eds.), *Die Septuaginta—Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten* (WUNT 219; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), pp. 336–52.
 - ‘Text History of the Books of Samuel: An Assessment of the Recent Research’, in P. Hugo and A. Schenker (eds.), *Archaeology of the Books of Samuel: The Entangling of the Textual and Literary History* (VTSup 132; Leiden: Brill, 2010), pp. 1–19.
 - ‘The Unique Messiah: A Tendency in Favour of David’s Kingship in the MT of Samuel’, in K. De Troyer, T.M. Law and M. Liljeström (eds.), *In the Footsteps of Sherlock Holmes* (Festschrift A. Aejmelaeus; CBET 72; Leuven: Peeters, 2014), pp. 331–51.
- Hutzli, J., *Die Erzählung von Hanna und Samuel. Textkritische und literarische Analyse von 1. Samuel 1–2 unter Berücksichtigung des Kontextes* (ATHANT 89; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2007).
- ‘Mögliche Retuschen am Davidbild in der masoretischen Fassung der Samuelbücher’, in W. Dietrich (ed.), *David und Saul im Widerstreit—Diachronie und Synchronie im Wettstreit* (OBO 206; Fribourg: Academic Press, 2004), pp. 102–15.
 - ‘Theologische Textänderungen im Massoretischen Text und in der Septuaginta von 1–2 Sam’, in P. Hugo and A. Schenker (eds.), *Archaeology of the Books of Samuel: The Entangling of the Textual and Literary History* (VTSup 132; Leiden: Brill, 2010), pp. 213–36.
- Johnson, B., *Die hexaplarische Rezension des 1. Samuelbuches der Septuaginta* (STL 22; Lund: Gleerup, 1963).
- Kauhanen, T., *The Proto-Lucianic Problem in 1 Samuel* (DSI 3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2012).

- Kelly, B.H., 'The Septuagint Translators of I Samuel and II Samuel 1:1–11:1' (Ph.D. dissertation, Princeton University, 1948).
- Kreuzer, S., 'From "Old Greek" to the Recension: Who and What Caused the Change of the Hebrew Reference Text of the Septuagint?', in W. Kraus and R.G. Wooden (eds.), *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures*, (SBLSCS 53; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), pp. 225–37.
- 'Textformen und Bearbeitungen. Kriterien zur Frage der ältesten Textgestalt, insbesondere des Septuagintatextes, anhand von 2 Sam 12', in P. Hugo and A. Schenker (eds.), *Archaeology of the Books of Samuel: The Entangling of the Textual and Literary History* (VTSup 132; Leiden: Brill, 2010), pp. 91–115.
- 'Towards the Old Greek: New Criteria for the Analysis of the Recensions of the Septuagint (Especially the Antiochene / Lucianic Text and *Kaige* Recension)', in M.K.H. Peters (ed.), *XIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Ljubljana 2007* (SBLSCS 55; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), pp. 239–53.
- 'Translation and Recensions: Old Greek, *Kaige*, and Antiochene Text in Samuel and Reigns', *BIOSCS* 42 (2009), pp. 34–51.
- La Bannardière, A.-M., 'Les livres de Samuel et des Rois, les livres des Chroniques et d'Esdras dans l'œuvre de saint Augustin', *Études Augustiniennes* 2 (1956), pp. 335–64.
- Law, T.M., and T. Kauhanen, 'Methodological Remarks on the Textual History of Reigns: A Response to Siegfried Kreuzer', *BIOSCS* 43 (2010), pp. 73–88.
- Lefebvre, P., *Livres de Samuel et récits de résurrection. Le messie ressuscité 'selon les Écrivains'* (LD 196; Paris: Cerf, 2004).
- Liljeström, M., 'Looking for Fragments of the Syrohexapla: The Song of Hannah in Barberiniani Orientali 2 as a Test Case', *BIOSCS* 40 (2007), pp. 49–61.
- Lust, J., 'David dans la Septante', in L. Desrousseaux and J. Vermeylen (eds.), *Figures de David à travers la Bible: XVII^e congrès de l'ACFEB (1997)* (LD 177; Paris: Cerf, 1999), pp. 243–63.
- Marquis, G., 'Word Order as a Criterion for the Evaluation of Translation Technique in the LXX and the Evaluation of Word Order Variants as Exemplified in LXX-Ezechiel', *Textus* 13 (1986), pp. 59–84.
- Meloni, P., 'David', in A. Di Bernardino (ed.), *Encyclopedia of the Early Church*, vol. I (Cambridge: Clarke, 1992), pp. 220–21.
- Metzger, B.M., 'The Lucianic Recension', in *Chapters in the History of New Testament Textual Criticism* (NTTS 4; Leiden: Brill, 1963), pp. 1–41.
- Mez, A., *Die Bibel des Josephus untersucht für Buch V–VII der Archäologie* (Basel: Jaeger & Kober, 1895).
- Muraoka, T., 'The Greek Texts of Samuel-Kings: Incomplete Translations of Recensional Activity', *AbrN* 21 (1982–83), pp. 28–49.
- Notet, E., 'Josephus and the Books of Samuel', in S.J.D. Cohen and J.J. Schwartz (eds.), *Studies in Josephus and the Varieties of Ancient Judaism* (Festschrift

- L.H. Feldman; *Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* 67; Leiden: Brill, 2007), pp. 141–67.
- Parsons, P.J., ‘The Scripts and Their Date’, in E. Tov (ed.), *The Greek Minor Prophets Scrolls from Nahal Hever (8HevSIIgr)* (DJD VIII; Oxford: Clarendon, 1990), pp. 19–36.
- Piquer, A., P. Torijano and J. Trebolle Barrera, ‘Septuagint Versions, Greek Recensions and Hebrew Editions: The Text-Critical Evaluation of the Old Latin, Armenian and Georgian Versions in *III-IV Regnorum*’, in H. Ausloos, J. Cook, F. García Martínez, B. Lemmelijn and M. Vervenne (eds.), *Translating a Translation: The LXX and Its Modern Translations in the Context of Early Judaism* (BETL 213; Leuven: Peeters, 2008), pp. 251–81.
- Pisano, S., *Additions or Omissions in the Books of Samuel: The Significant Pluses and Minuses in the Massoretic, LXX and Qumran Texts* (OBO 57; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984).
- ‘Alcune osservazioni sul racconto di Davide e Golia. Confronto fra TM e LXX’, *Annali di Scienze Religiose* 10 (2005), pp. 129–37.
- Rahlfs, A., *Septuaginta-Studien I-III* (2nd ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965).
- Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments* (MSU 1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1914).
- Rahlfs, A., and D. Fraenkel, *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments*, vol. I,1 (Septuaginta I; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004).
- Rezetko, R., *Source and Revision in the Narratives of David’s Transfer of the Ark: Text, Language, and Story in 2 Samuel 6 and 1 Chronicles 13, 15–16* (LHBOTS 470; New York: T&T Clark International, 2007).
- Saley, R.J., ‘Greek Lucianic Doublets and 4QSam^a’, *BIOSCS* 40 (2007), pp. 63–73.
- ‘Proto-Lucian and 4QSam^a’, *BIOSCS* 41 (2008), pp. 34–45.
- The Samuel Manuscript of Jacob of Edessa: A Study in Its Underlying Textual Traditions* (Monographs of the Peshitta Institute Leiden; Leuven: Brill, 1998).
- Salvsen, A., *The Books of Samuel in the Syriac Version of Jacob of Edessa* (Monographs of the Peshitta Institute Leiden; Leuven: Brill, 1999).
- Schenker, A., ‘Textverderbnis und literarische Umgestaltung. Textgeschichte von 1 Sam 5:1-6 im Vergleich zwischen dem hebräischen Text der Massoreten und der ältesten Griechischen Bibel’, in P. Hugo and A. Schenker (eds.), *Archaeology of the Books of Samuel: The Entangling of the Textual and Literary History* (VTSup 132; Leiden: Brill, 2010), pp. 237–60.
- ‘Die Verheissung Natans in 2Sam 7 in der Septuaginta. Wie erklären sich die Differenzen zwischen Massoretischem Text und LXX, und was bedeuten sie für die messianische Würde des davidischen Hauses in der LXX?’, in M.A. Knibb (ed.), *The Septuagint and Messianism* (BETL 195; Leuven: Peeters, 2006), pp. 177–92.
- Shenkel, J.D., *Chronology and Recensional Development in the Greek Text of Kings* (HSM 1; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1968).

- Soisalon-Soininen, I., *Infinitive in der Septuaginta* (AASF B 132,1; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1965).
- Sollamo, R., *Rendering of Hebrew Semipropositions in the Septuagint* (AASF B Diss 19; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1979).
- Taylor, B.A., *The Lucianic Manuscripts of 1 Reigns*. Vol. I, *Majority Text*; Vol. II, *Analysis* (HSM 50-51; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992–93).
- Thackeray, H.St.J., ‘The Greek Translation of the Four Books of Kings’, *JTS* 8 (1907), pp. 262–78.
- The Septuagint and Jewish Worship: A Study in Origins* (2nd ed.; London: Milford, 1923).
- Tov, E., ‘Different Editions of the Song of Hannah and Its Narrative Framework’, in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible* (VTSup 72; Leiden: Brill, 1999), pp. 433–55.
- ‘Lucian and Proto-Lucian: Toward a New Solution of the Problem’, *RB* 19 (1972), pp. 101–13.
- Trebolle Barrera, J., ‘Samuel/Kings and Chronicles: Book Divisions and Textual Composition’, in P.W. Flint, E. Tov, and J.C. VanderKam (eds.), *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septuagint* (Festschrift E. Ulrich; VTSup 101; Leiden: Brill, 2006), pp. 96–108.
- ‘The Story of David and Goliath (1Sam 17–18): Textual Variants and Literary Composition’, *BIOSCS* 2 (1990), pp. 16–23.
- ‘Textual Criticism and the Composition History of Samuel: Connections between Pericopes in 1 Samuel 1–4’, in P. Hugo and A. Schenker (eds.), *Archaeology of the Books of Samuel: The Entangling of the Textual and Literary History* (VTSup 132; Leiden: Brill, 2010), pp. 261–85.
- Ulrich, E., ‘Josephus’ Biblical Text for the Books of Samuel’, in L.H. Feldman and G. Hata (eds.), *Josephus, the Bible, and History* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1989), pp. 81–96.
- ‘The Old Latin Translation of the LXX and the Hebrew Scrolls from Qumran’, in E. Tov (ed.), *The Hebrew and Greek Texts of Samuel* (Jerusalem: Academion, 1980), pp. 121–65.
- The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus* (HSM 19; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978).
- Voitila, A., ‘The Use of Tenses in the L- and B-Texts in the Kaige-Section of 2 Reigns’, in S. Kreuzer, M. Meiser, and M. Sigismund (eds.), *Die Septuaginta—Entstehung, Sprache, Geschichte* (WUNT 286; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), pp. 213–37.
- Walters, S.D., ‘Childless Michal, Mother of Five’, in M.E. Cohen, D.C. Snell, and D.B. Weisberg (eds.), *The Tablet and the Scroll: Near East Studies* (Festschrift W.W. Hallo; Bethesda: CDL, 1993), pp. 290–96.
- ‘Hannah and Anna: The Greek and Hebrew Texts of 1 Samuel 1’, *JBL* 107 (1988), pp. 385–412.
- Wevers, J.W., ‘A Study in the Exegetical Principles Underlying the Greek Text of 2 Sm 11:2–1 Kings 2:11’, *CBQ* 15 (1953), pp. 30–45.

3–4 Kingdoms (1–2 Kings)

Timothy Michael Law

Editions

(a) Standard Greek Editions

Göttingen (currently in preparation; eds. Barrera and Morales).
Cambridge, vol. II.2, *I and II Kings* (Brooke, McLean, and Thackeray, 1930).¹
Rahlfs-Hanhart, vol. I, pp. 623–92, 693–751.²
Swete, vol. I, pp. 669–740, 741–802.

(b) Other Greek Editions

Lucianic tradition, *El Texto Antioqueno*, vol. II (Fernández Marcos and Busto Saiz, 1992).

(c) Modern Translations³

NETS (Taylor and McLean, 2007), pp. 297–319, 320–41.⁴
LXX.D (Bösenecker *et al.*, 2009), pp. 383–423, 424–88.
La Biblia Griega, vol. II (Fernández Marcos *et al.*, 2011), pp. 313–428.

1. Cambridge (and Swete) are editions of Vaticanus, which preserves the *kaige* revision but has largely escaped Origen's so-called 'Hexaplaric' recension.

2. Based primarily on Vaticanus, but occasionally emended the text with readings from Alexandrinus and the Lucianic, or Antiochian, recension.

3. All translations to date have used either Vaticanus or Rahlfs-Hanhart as the base text.

4. Based on Rahlfs-Hanhart; non-*kaige* sections trans. by Taylor, *kaige* by McLean. Taylor's non-*kaige* section has been given the name 'Old Greek', even though no critical edition exists.

I. General Characteristics

For the title and a full discussion of the major recensional activity of 3–4 Kingdoms, see Hugo’s chapter on 1–2 Kingdoms in the present volume.

The relationship of 3–4 Kingdoms to its Hebrew *Vorlage* perplexes scholars. The translation technique or transmission errors often explain the differences between the Greek and Hebrew in many of the other books in the LXX. In others like 3 Kingdoms, the differences in the text seem to have been introduced deliberately. The Greek translator or a later Greek reviser may have made these modifications, or they could have been present in the translator’s Hebrew *Vorlage*. The variations are not only lexicographical or syntactical but also include large-scale differences: the rearrangement of narrative sections, including the transposition of 3 Kingdoms 20 and 21, the duplication of material found elsewhere, and different versions of the same section (3 Kgdms 2.35a-n, 46a-l; 5.14a, b; 6.1a-d, 36a; 9.9a; 10.22a-c; 12.24a-z; 16.26a-h).

Determining the *Vorlage* of the OG, the earliest translation layer, is a challenge for 3 Kingdoms, because we have yet to identify the OG itself. The main recensions in the textual history have complicated the picture considerably. The hebraising *kaige* revision has already been discussed (see Hugo’s chapter on 1–2 Kingdoms in the present volume) and the findings there are also relevant here. Since Vaticanus has preserved *kaige*, scholars usually show the *kaige* sections the same attention they would the OG. The first *kaige* section ($\beta\gamma$) ends at 3 Kgdms 2.11 and the second ($\gamma\delta$) spans 3 Kingdoms 22 through to the end of final book of Kingdoms. The Antiochian, or Lucianic, recension plays an important part in the textual history since it contains older—and often the oldest—readings in the *kaige* sections. Thus, some claim that in the non-*kaige* section ($\gamma\gamma$) B is the best witness to the OG, and in the *kaige* sections ($\beta\gamma$ and $\gamma\delta$) the Antiochian recension provides access to the OG. Yet to assume that *all* readings found in these sections of B and the Antiochian text *are* the OG would be to oversimplify. For example, the editorial layers added to the Antiochian text during its own evolution have sometimes covered up the oldest text (Fernández Marcos, ‘Lucianic’). We should rather more prudently affirm that B in the non-*kaige* sections and the Antiochian in the *kaige* sections are *the best witnesses to the*

oldest strata of the Greek text (Hugo, *Les deux visages*, p. 53; Law and Kauhanen, ‘Methodological’), while recognising that all readings must be handled on a case-by-case basis.

Furthermore, in some cases the recensional activity has so obscured our view of the OG that we must rely upon the versions. Treballe Barrera has often argued that the *Vetus latina* alone retains the oldest readings for 3–4 Kingdoms (‘From the *Old Latin*’; ‘Old Latin’; see also Hugo, *Les deux visages*), and newer research proposes that there are even cases where the minor versions, namely the Armenian and Georgian, are the sole conservator of the OG (Piquer *et al.*, ‘Septuagint Versions’).

II. Time and Place of Composition

The translation of 1–2 Kings necessarily took place between the translation of the Greek Pentateuch in the third century B.C.E. and the *kaige* revision of the first (see below). Schenker (*Septante*, pp. 152–53; *Älteste*, p. 9) and Hugo (*Les deux visages*, pp. 106–107) have both dated Kingdoms to the second century, based partly on their hypothesis that the MT was a new edition of the Hebrew *Vorlage* of Kingdoms. Since they believe the new edition of Kings was completed in the second half of the second century B.C.E.—Schenker places it more precisely between 140–130 B.C.E. (*Septante*, pp. 36–37, 152–53; ‘Die Zwei’, pp. 34–35; *Älteste*, pp. 185–87)—the OG must have been translated beforehand. A fragment of Demetrius the Chronographer might provide independent support for dating the Greek translation of Samuel–Kings to the third century B.C.E., but this would depend on confidently assigning an early date to the work of Demetrius itself. If he did indeed write in the end of the third century, his fragment would be crucial to our dating of 3–4 Kingdoms, but even more so to the dating of the Pentateuch, since Demetrius is the only witness to provide support to Aristéas’s dating to the third century for the translation of the Torah. Nonetheless, even without Demetrius, we have the relatively secure mid-second century B.C.E. date of Eupolemus, who was already using the account of the building of the temple from 3 Kingdoms 5–8 and 2 Chronicles 2–5. The middle of the second century is thus the latest date for the translation of Kingdoms.

The books of Kingdoms were probably translated in Alexandria along with, or immediately following, the translation of the Pentateuch, especially if Alexandrian Jewish historians were familiar with the text so early. As in 1–2 Kingdoms, the *kaige* revision of 3–4 Kingdoms can be dated to the first century B.C.E, probably but not necessarily in Palestine (Kraft, ‘Reassessing’, p. 12; cf. Abate, *La fine*, p. 22).

III. Language

Taylor (NETS, p. 245) admits that first impressions of the OG indicate a Semitised Greek, and this is certainly true on the level of idiom and word order. Nonetheless, while the translator closely adheres to the word order of his Hebrew *Vorlage*, the grammar and syntax is certainly Koine Greek. The text lacks the characteristics of literary Greek: for example, μέν never appears in γγ; δέ appears only 16 times;⁵ and the Greek hypotactic style is eschewed in favour of the paratactic norm of the Hebrew. There can be no doubt *kaige* is likewise not a specimen of literary Greek. More so than the OG translator, this reviser created many peculiarities in his attempt to mirror his Hebrew text (see below).

Spottorno (‘Lexical’) has discussed several lexical peculiarities of the historical books, including cases where the Antiochian recension has contributed to the development of Greek lexicography. Among the unique words found only in Kingdoms and Paralipomena are those with the root κολλυρ-, εὐαγγελ-, τρισσ-, and the related words στρογγύλος and στρογγύλωσις.

IV. Translation and Composition

A sufficient number of studies on the translation technique of 3–4 Kingdoms have yet to appear, such that any claims about the translator’s methods should be made tentatively and with the expectation that conclusions may need to be modified at a later date. Deboys’s work on

5. Taylor notes that δέ appears only 14 times in the OG sections of Kingdoms. By our count, he must have meant only the OG of 1–2 Kingdoms, since there are an additional 16 in 3 Kingdoms.

4 Kingdoms is the closest we have to any comprehensive treatment of the textual layers in these books, but even he admitted a detailed examination of translation technique was ‘impractical’ at the time of his writing (*Greek Text*, p. 184). The more recent volume by Turkanik (*Of Kings*) aimed to be a study of the translation technique of the γγ section of 3 Kingdoms, but was more of an analysis of the exegetical tendencies of the translator (see Law, ‘How Not to’) rather than the grammatical-syntactical analysis needed.

In the absence of monographs, there is a provisional aid in the abbreviated comments of Taylor and McLean in NETS. The former highlights several of the features of the OG sections of 1–4 Kingdoms, and the latter comments on the *kaige* sections. We may mention their conclusions, though at the same time we encourage readers of the LXX to treat with caution these artificial boundaries: it should not be a surprise when one discovers *kaige* elements in a non-*kaige* portion of the text, and vice versa. For the sake of clarity, however, we will keep to the traditional divisions to discuss individual characteristics of the respective translations.

a. Old Greek (3 Kingdoms 2.12–21.43)

Taylor noted several characteristics of the OG, to which we add some of our own observations (see Hugo’s chapter on 1–2 Kingdoms in the present volume). (a) The translation of the OG is literal and isomorphic, though not of the artificial quality of Aquila’s translation. The translator attempts, for the most part, to translate every constituent in Hebrew, leading to such redundancies as that of the personal pronoun. (b) This literal approach, however, sometimes gives the resultant Greek phrase a different meaning than that intended by the Hebrew. One example is the translation of the Hebrew בִּי (‘I pray’ or ‘O!’) by ἐν ἐμοί (‘in/by me’), in 3.17, 26. On the level of the phrase, we may note שבט יהודה (‘tribe of Judah’) is translated σκήπτρου Ιουδα (‘staff/scepter of Judah’) as in 12.20. (c) Awkward Greek syntax is at times unavoidable in a literal translation. (d) The OG translator often transliterates proper nouns. Two common words, however, are translated where they are transliterated elsewhere in LXX: צבאות as παντοκράτωρ (19.10, 14) or δύναμις ‘power’ (17.1 [absent from MT]; 18.15) instead of σαβαωθ; and פלשתים as ἀλλόφυλος/–οι ‘of another tribe’ instead of φυλιστιμ. (e) There are also a

number of neologisms: ἀπελέκητος ‘unhewn’ (6.1a, 36, 48, 49; 10.11, 12 bis), κοιλοσταθμέω ‘to provide with panels’ (6.9), δικτυόμαι ‘to be wrought in net-work’ (7.6), and ὄλυρίτης ‘made of *olura*’ (19.6).

b. *Kaige* (3 Kingdoms 1.1–2.11; 22.1–4 Kingdoms 25)

If the OG translator was, as we have affirmed, faithful to his Hebrew *Vorlage*, it should not be surprising that *kaige*, known to be a hebraising recension, shares many features with the oldest Greek text. Nonetheless, there are distinctive features of the *kaige* sections of 3–4 Kingdoms. Most of these have been discussed before (useful summaries in NETS, pp. 271–76; Abate, *La fine*, pp. 20–22). (a) There are a number of translation equivalents consistently found in the *kaige* sections: the *kaige* reviser typically uses καί γε for םג and גג, whereas the OG translator simply uses καί; אני is rendered by ἐγώ and אני אנכי בי by ἐγώ εἰμί, the latter even when followed by a finite verb; שופר ‘ram’s horn’ is rendered by κερατίνη ‘horn’ in *kaige*, instead of the OG σάλπιγξ ‘trumpet’; and מע ‘from’ awkwardly becomes ἐπάνωθεν or ἀπάνωθεν ‘from upon’, whereas the OG has ἀπό and ἐπάνω ‘from’. (b) Even more than the OG translator, *kaige* follows a method of ‘rigid isomorphism’ (NETS, p. 271), which often introduces unidiomatic Greek at the clause or sentence level, but also at the level of the word, as for example in למ/ἐπάνωθεν-ἀπάνωθεν. Other oddities occur: the infinitive absolute + finite verb in Hebrew is translated by a finite verb + cognate participle/cognate dative (e.g., 3 Kgdms 22.28; 4 Kgdms 8.10); the םא of oath formulae are not translated as emphatic negatives, but instead as the conditional εἰ ‘if’ (e.g., 3 Kgdms 2.8); subordinate clauses were not respected, but were instead coordinated by the simple translation of ו with καί. (c) Stereotyping of משפט with κρίσις produces the odd rendering in 4 Kgdms 1.7 where the Hebrew has the sense of ‘kind/sort/manner’ and not ‘judgement’. There are at least two more of the same stereotypes which are common elsewhere in the LXX: תיבת/κιβωτός (‘ark’) and ברכ/εὐλογέω (‘to bless’). (d) Excluding persons and places, there are 26 transliterations in γδ. (e) Possible neologisms are also found in *kaige*. In γδ there are two: μονόζωνος ‘a lightly armed man’ (4 Kgdms 5.2; 6.23; 13.20, 21; 24.2), and διακάμπτω ‘bend or turn about’, unique to 4 Kgdms 4.34.

Since the artificial boundaries often lead readers to the mistaken assumption that all *kaige* features are to be found only within the *kaige* sections on the one hand, and that everything within a *kaige* section will resemble that recension on the other, it should be noted in concluding this section that *kaige* is not a monolithic revision, but rather a composite text which has at its base the OG from which sporadic partial revisions were made towards the proto-MT (Law and Kauhanen, ‘Methodological’).

V. Key Text-Critical Issues

The most difficult questions in the research on 3–4 Kingdoms defy explanations that are strictly ‘text-critical’. Indeed, the past few decades of research—especially work conducted after Wevers—have taught us that textual criticism is only the starting point: answers to the textual history of some books in the LXX must also involve literary criticism (Hugo, ‘Text History’).

The Greek text of Kingdoms has unfortunately too often been viewed as an aberrant text produced by a translator who freely departs from a Hebrew *Vorlage* similar to the one now found in MT. This is especially true of recent commentators of the Hebrew books of Kings who have almost uniformly discounted or ignored the arguments of their nineteenth-century predecessors, many of whom contended that behind 3–4 Kingdoms was a Hebrew *Vorlage* that differed significantly from MT. Not being aware of more recent trends in scholarship, these modern commentators have relied upon outdated LXX studies and have shown a reluctance to depart from a pre-Qumran view of the Hebrew text (Law, ‘How Not to’).

The past several decades of research on the Greek text by LXX scholars have established two primary positions in the debate (see the syntheses and bibliographies in Van Keulen, *Two Versions*, pp. 4–20, and more thoroughly Hugo, *Les deux visages*, pp. 5–117). Wevers, Gooding, Van Keulen and Turkanik have argued that Kingdoms is based on the proto-MT, but their explanations differ on how the divergences between the Greek and Hebrew texts came about. Wevers and most recently Turkanik attribute the differences to the activity of the translator(s), and Gooding and Van Keulen to later revisers. Others argue

that the Greek translator had a different Hebrew *Vorlage* than MT. Within this latter group are further nuances still: Talshir and Tov have argued that behind Kingdoms is a Hebrew text which is a midrashic revision of, and thus later than, MT, while for Treballe, Schenker and Hugo Kingdoms reflects a Hebrew *Vorlage* that precedes the final redaction of the proto-MT.

Wevers was the first to study the translation technique of Kingdoms in three articles from 1950–52. Since Wevers believed the LXX text of Kingdoms could not be used for the textual criticism of MT before a study of translation technique, he sought to determine the motivations—most of which he concluded were ideological (§ VI)—of the translator(s) of the $\beta\gamma$, $\gamma\gamma$ and $\gamma\delta$ sections of Kingdoms. Unfortunately, Wevers never discussed the pluses or minuses, nor did he address the more significant differences between the Greek and Hebrew texts, such as the Miscellanies (3 Kgdms 2.35a-k, 46a-l) and the rearrangement of certain sections (cf. Van Keulen, *Two Versions*, p. 5). Wevers unequivocally attributed the divergences between the two versions to the hermeneutical principles of the translator of the Greek version. Wevers's studies on Kings were written prior to the findings of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the significance of the identification of the *kaige* recension making their impact on Septuagint scholarship.

From 1964–76, Gooding wrote nine important studies that argued Kingdoms was secondary to MT, but he differed from Wevers as to when the divergences came about. Gooding determined that the Greek text, while for the most part faithful to a proto-MT *Vorlage*, reveals two chief tendencies: to arrange the narrative in a logical and chronological order, and to whitewash the representations of David, Solomon, Jeroboam and Ahab. For Gooding, while the reordering and reinterpretation are from the same hand, they are not the doing of the original translator; rather, they come from a later revision to the Greek text. Moreover, differences such as the one in the duplicate tradition attested by 3 Kgdms 12.24a-z were probably based partly on written Hebrew sources that differed from MT, and partly on oral exegetical traditions (Gooding, 'Problems', p. 27). While the LXX follows MT closely in parts, in other places the translation has the appearance of midrash, and is thus a commentary on Kings ('Problems', pp. 25–29) prepared by a reviser. As Hugo noted (*Les deux visages*, p. 96), Gooding was one of the first to demonstrate the narrative

coherence of LXX. He proved that most of the differences were not the result of accidents in the transmission, but were instead deliberate changes introduced into the text.

Recently, Van Keulen examined the Solomon Narrative in 1 Kings/3 Kingdoms 2–11, arguing that the Greek text shows two hands at work, the OG translator and a later reviser, most evident when comparing the Miscellanies to the main text. While the reviser was working on the basis of a Greek text, possibly the OG, ‘he must have drawn upon Hebrew texts for his revision’ (Van Keulen, *Two Versions*, p. 302). This is not to suggest the reviser took the reinterpretations and reorderings from a Hebrew source; in contrast to Gooding, Van Keulen insists that the reviser alone was responsible for the rearrangement of the text, not oral traditions or any other Hebrew written material that had already effected the revisions and reordering.

The most recent scholar to follow this trajectory is Turkanik (*Of Kings*), whose monograph is the first to focus on the $\gamma\gamma$ section. Turkanik is closer to Wevers than to Gooding and Van Keulen. In his view, the translator’s *Vorlage* could only have been the proto-MT in almost every instance, and there would not have been any other process of revision within the Greek tradition which led to $\gamma\gamma$; instead, the divergent text of $\gamma\gamma$ was the product of a translator-editor who operated as the translator of LXX Isaiah, modifying the text to suit his own purposes as he worked through his translation (Turkanik, *Of Kings*, p. 209).

Bogaert’s objections to Gooding (‘Compte rendu’, pp. 99–100) are also relevant for Van Keulen and Turkanik. First, they have failed to give due consideration to the textual fluidity in the Hebrew tradition before the standardisation of the Hebrew text in the second century C.E. Second, Gooding in particular mixed the concepts of targumism and recension: the former moves away from its text, while the latter moves back towards the text. Finally, Jewish exegesis sought to make a clear distinction between its text and the commentary on that text; these scholars would suggest that these exegetes were confounding the two. Van Keulen in particular makes the suggestion that Greek revisers would have taken the Greek text further away from the proto-MT, when all evidence of recensions and revisions points in the opposite direction.

But not all view Kingdoms as a Greek text based originally on the proto-MT. Talshir has argued that 3 Kingdoms evinces midrashic activity similar to the type suggested by Gooding, but that it was already present in the Hebrew *Vorlage*. In her analyses of 3 Kingdoms 11 and 12.24a-z ('Alternate Tradition'; *Alternative Story*), Talshir points out that there are 'no signs of [the original] having been composed in Greek' ('Image', I). In 3 Kingdoms 11, the reviser has reordered material already in his source; in 12.24a-z, Talshir's 'Alternate Tradition', the Hebrew midrashist intentionally misled his readers to believe they were reading an authentic historical account when in reality he had simply added to the text his own story to praise Solomon and vilify Jeroboam and Rehoboam more than his source (proto-MT) had done ('Alternate Tradition', pp. 286–87). Though this revision by the midrashist shares some resemblances with the work of the Chronicler, it was only partial and not as ideologically driven ('Contribution', pp. 33–39; 'Reign', p. 235). Thus, in 12.24a-z, the Hebrew source is 'not fundamentally divergent from the Book of Kings' ('Alternate Tradition', p. 618); Talshir warns against using the Alternate Tradition to determine the literary development of the text of Kings since more often than not the features of the Greek text are the result of the 'inner needs of their own composition' ('Alternate Tradition', p. 618), and not indicative of another phase in the textual history.

Finally, there has been a group of scholars who have argued that the Hebrew *Vorlage* of Kingdoms is in fact an older Hebrew form than that found in MT. More than forty years ago Shenkel (*Chronology*) contested what had at that time become orthodoxy, and instead argued that the chronologies of the regnal formulae in 3–4 Kingdoms are superior to their formulation in MT, and more than likely reflect a different *Vorlage*. Though a valuable study in its own right, Shenkel's essentially prepared the ground for what was to come from the 1980s to now.

Trebolle Barrera has argued that the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the OG is a more ancient text than the proto-MT. In fact, the MT is itself a 'recension' of the 'Old Hebrew', a parallel process to what has happened between the OG and its various recensions ('From the *Old Latin*', pp. 105–106). Therefore, the OG and the *Vetus latina*, the latter of which is often the only witness to the former, take us back to the Old Hebrew, while the later *kaige* and Hexaplaric forms can only be traced back to the MT. The

MT was produced by an editor that has rearranged material, ‘incorporating into the main body of the book the Hebrew supplements and miscellanies translated by the OG’ (‘Text-Critical’, p. 296). Many literary developments in the text of MT are marked by the frequent use of *Wiederaufnahme* (*Centena*, pp. 117–51; ‘Text-Critical’, pp. 285–99). Thus, readings that scholars often assume were left untranslated in the OG are at times in fact ‘pluses’ in MT. Trebolle Barrera sees such divergences between the texts mostly as the result of earlier literary and redactional processes: ‘The most substantial variants that differentiate these two basic textual forms are not phenomena which occurred in the process of the Hebrew textual transmission or of the translation into Greek. They are rather traces of an intensive earlier editorial activity’ (Trebolle Barrera, *Centena*, p. 296).

Schenker, however, argues that certain theological considerations of the redactors of the proto-MT were more often the cause of the editing of the older Hebrew text. If Trebolle Barrera’s approach may be called literary, Schenker’s is theological. The Hebrew *Vorlage* of Kingdoms is for the latter a distinct edition of a Hebrew text produced under the auspices of some scribal authority. The style of the Greek indicates that the translator followed his source text very closely and therefore must have been working from a different edition than that found in MT. In Schenker’s view, the editors of the proto-MT are responsible for introducing new, and modifying prior, theological emphases in the Hebrew tradition. In his monograph on 3 Kingdoms/1 Kings 2–14 (*Septante*), Schenker pointed out four main developments in the MT of themes that were either lacking or not underscored in the LXX. In the newer Hebrew edition, Solomon’s power is made more impressive, his righteousness is made more certain, the king does not appoint the priest, and the Samaritans are vilified. These are but a few examples in which Schenker sees a conscious effort on the part of the editors of the proto-MT to modify the theology of the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX.

Schenker’s student Hugo took a similar approach (*Les deux visages*) on the Elijah narrative in 3 Kingdoms 17–19. Hugo studied both the LXX and the MT in their own narrative and theological logic, and compared one with the other. By refusing to create an eclectic text composed of elements of both, Hugo sought to establish the chronology of both texts so that he could then decide which was the oldest literary form (p. 118).

He successfully avoided the two extremes of a rigorous literary analysis that ignores textual criticism on the one hand, and the naïve assumption of the complete objectivity of textual criticism. Hugo's conclusion was that MT represents not only a later text, but also a re-edition of the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX; because two different editions existed, the critic must determine the reasons why an editor would change what was already in the tradition. Like Schenker before him, Hugo argued that the most reasonable explanation for many of these changes is a theological agenda by those responsible for creating the proto-MT.

As the foregoing has demonstrated, a study of translation technique and textual criticism alone will not answer every question in books like Kingdoms because these have problems of a different sort. Approaching Kingdoms in the same way one may approach other LXX books invites a distortion of the evidence since it is believed, *a priori*, that the translators' methods can be determined by comparison with the MT. If the *Vorlage* of Kingdoms is different to the MT, whether created prior to or after the latter, textual criticism and translation technical study can only be part of the researcher's methodology. Sufficient attention must also be paid to literary criticism. When this is done, the OG of Kingdoms becomes an invaluable source also for the literary and redactional history of the Hebrew text, as a witness to a stage prior to the MT. Nonetheless, many of the features of the putative *Vorlage* of Kingdoms are identical to the MT, so that if the MT is indeed a new edition of an older Hebrew text, it was not a panoptic revision but one that attempted to clarify only some of the most theologically significant issues. Readers should remain open to the possibility that the different explanations offered by these scholars might each take their turn at being the most plausible on any given textual problem.

VI. Ideology and Exegesis

Little can be said about the ideology and exegesis of 4 Kingdoms since, as a complete *kaige* text, it very faithfully follows MT. Nonetheless, McLean notes the following theological interpretations in *kaige*'s work in 4 Kingdoms: MT often refers to Elisha as 'man of God', whereas *kaige* sometimes simply has Ελισαιε (but see for example 4.25, where it is clear

kaige does not follow this consistently); at 20.17, if a different Hebrew *Vorlage* is not behind *kaige*, the reviser emphasises the efficacy of the Lord's word: דבר אמר יהוה לא יותר—καὶ οὐχ ὑπολειφθήσεται ῥῆμα δ' εἶπεν κύριος.

As for 3 Kingdoms, one's view on who was responsible for the divergences in the Greek and Hebrew traditions will determine the extent to which the translator might have been responsible for theological interpretation. If the translator was faithful to his *Vorlage*, which was different from the MT, his influence is relatively light and the responsibility for major theological emphases should be attributed to those who modified the earliest Hebrew text. If, however, the translator is responsible for the differences, he is the one to whom ideological changes should be attributed. For example, van Keulen argues that in 3 Kgdms 10.22a-c, the translator/reviser has deviated from MT 9.15-22 so that he could elaborate on the theme of 'oppression of the Canaanite population' (*Two Versions*, p. 200). Moreover, the deliberate decision to place this section between vv. 22 and 23 yet again highlights Solomon's wisdom, this time in handling the Canaanites (*Two Versions*, pp. 200–201).

According to the other view, the theology that may be discerned in the OG *vis-à-vis* the MT was not introduced at all by the Greek translator. Instead, MT represents a development from an older Hebrew text. For example, Hugo argues in the story of Elijah's resurrection of the boy in 1 Kgs 17.17-24 that MT makes more explicit certain elements that were implicit in the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the LXX (*Les deux visages*, p. 173). In MT 17.21-22, Elijah stretched out over the child and God then raised him up; in the LXX, however, Elijah breathed into the child—likewise, in 2 Kings 4 it was Elisha. The editor of MT places a limitation on Elijah, and reduces his role to that of an intercessor, thus ensuring the reader's only conclusion would be that the true power of resurrection belongs to God alone, and not even to the prophet. Turkanik (*Of Kings*, p. 110), however, concludes that the Greek translator introduced the change since he did not want to attribute to Elijah an action that had the appearance of sorcery. However, the Greek version's account of Elijah breathing into the child makes him no less of a magician than the MT's of Elijah stretching out over the boy. Hugo's argument is not only more detailed but also more compelling: MT elevates God's role as the sole agent responsible for the resuscitation.

Via these examples, one may note the various ways scholars attempt to make sense out of the divergences between the Greek and Hebrew texts of Kings, and to discern theological tendencies in the text.

VII. Reception History

The earliest confirmation we have of the reception of 3–4 Kingdoms is in the Jewish writer Demetrius the Chronographer's *On the Kings of Judea* (Bickerman, 'Demetrios', pp. 72–84). Writing in Greek probably during the reign of Ptolemy IV (221–205 B.C.E.) but certainly not later than the first half of the first century B.C.E. when Alexander Polyhistor drew upon his writing, Demetrius discusses the fall of Samaria and the fall of Jerusalem. The fragment has been preserved by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* 1.141.1-2) and its chronology is somewhat confusing, which may have been due to Demetrius himself, or perhaps to Polyhistor, or finally to Clement who used both traditions (Bickerman, 'Demetrios', pp. 80–84). Not long after Demetrius (or earlier depending on when one dates Demetrius), Eupolemus wrote a work probably also titled *On the Kings of Judea*, dated to the middle of the second century B.C.E., and left evidence that he used both Hebrew and Greek versions of Kings and Chronicles (*pace* Wacholder, *Eupolemus*, pp. 248–58).

Josephus gives a more elaborate description of the Temple (*War* 5; *Ant.* 8.3) than even that found in the biblical text, though his quotations are not always easy to trace since he did not translate the Bible *sensu stricto* (Spottorno, 'Josephus' Text', p. 145). Spottorno concluded that he likely used a Greek text that was in the first stages of the development of the Antiochian recension ('Josephus' Text', p. 152).

Many scholars have concluded that 2 Baruch (Apocalypse of Baruch) was originally composed in Hebrew, but Bogaert sees no reason to discount the possibility that it was composed in Greek in first century C.E. (Bogaert, *Apocalypse*). If so, it would be even more plausible that the author relied upon the Greek Kingdoms when referring to the curse of Jezebel (§ 62). *The Lives of the Prophets* is probably to be dated also around the first century C.E. and includes biographies of Elijah and Elisha. The *Hellenistic Synagoga Prayers* of the second or third century

are found in the *Apostolic Constitutions* (Funk, *Didascalia*). An invocation (7.37) whose subject matter would certainly have come from the LXX mentions Solomon, Elijah, Elisha and Hezekiah.

The New Testament writers mainly drew from the LXX when quoting the Old Testament. There are only two quotations of 3 Kingdoms and none of 4 Kingdoms. The two are in Rom. 11.3 (= 19.10, 14), 4 (=19.18), where the writer recalls God's promise to Elijah—that he kept a remnant of men who have not bowed the knee to Baal—to argue that God was keeping a remnant of Israelites who would participate in the salvation that Jesus brings. Mostly in the Gospels and Acts, the writers make allusions to the lives of Solomon, Elijah and Elisha (Mt. 6.28-29; Lk. 12.27; cf. 3 Kgdms 10; Lk. 4.24-27, cf. 3 Kgdms 18.1; 4 Kgdms 5.1-14; Acts 7.45-47, cf. 3 Kgdms 8.17-20).

The *Testament of Solomon*, a text that discusses the king's magical power over demons, was most likely a Christian work, but it may have originally been a Jewish document. Scholars date this work to the first few centuries C.E., possibly the third (Denis, *Introduction*, p. 67). Whether Christian or not, it reflects first-century Palestinian Judaism and draws upon the Greek text of Kingdoms.

Origen made use of the Greek Kingdoms in his homilies and commentaries, through which he also transmitted some readings of the other Greek Jewish versions. Several other patristic writers commented on 3–4 Kingdoms, though their works are only preserved in fragments. Petit has published several editions of texts from the catena tradition, two of which (*Autour; Sévère*) include comments on 3–4 Kingdoms attributed to Severus of Antioch, Procopius of Gaza, Theodore of Mopsuestia and Theodoret of Cyr. The latter has also figured prominently in the work of Fernández Marcos and Busto Saiz owing to their interest in the Antiochian tradition. Theirs is the latest edition of Theodoret's *Quaestiones in Reges et Paralipomena* (Fernández Marcos and Busto Saiz, *Theodoret*), but one is now in preparation for the Library of Early Christianity. A study of the Greek Patristic citations of 3–4 Kingdoms is desperately needed, as evidenced by the little we are able to say now. Among Latin writers, dependence on the OG text of Kingdoms is noted in the Old Latin quotations of Lucifer of Cagliari (Diercks, *Luciferi*).

Not only in the Syriac *Apocalypse of Baruch* were relics of Kingdoms mediated through the Syriac tradition. In the Syrohexapla (Law, ‘La version’), the Syriac translation of the LXX, the margins of the manuscripts of 3–4 Kingdoms are filled with quotations from other revisions and translations in the Greek tradition, such as the Antiochian text and the revisions of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion. The commentaries of ʾĪšō ‘dād of Merv (Van den Eynde, *Commentaire*) and Gregory Barhebraeus (Sauma, *Gregory*) also preserve Greek readings.

Texts discovered in the Cairo Genizah indicate 3–4 Kingdoms persisted in Byzantine Judaism. The fragments of Aquila’s version in 3 Kingdoms (Burkitt, *Fragments*) form the longest running text of any of the Three. The fragment T-S K24.14 (de Lange, *Greek*) contains glosses on Solomon’s building campaign and demonstrates that Aquila, Symmachus, Theodotion and other Greek recensions were still impacting Byzantine Jewish exegesis (Law, ‘Use’; de Lange *et al.*, *Jewish Reception*).

Christian art in the earliest centuries was heavily influenced by Graeco-Roman art and its themes. The apotheosis of Elijah appears in the fourth-century mosaics in the Cappella di Sant’Aquilino of the Basilica of St. Lawrence, Milan. During this same century, Elijah’s ascension becomes a new theme for Christian artists (Jensen, *Understanding*, p. 90), as he appears in more places, such as in the frescoes of the Via Latina catacomb. The Roman iconographic depiction of the emperor ascending in a quadriga, stretching his right hand to grasp the hand of the deity, is applied to Elijah in a carving on a wooden door in the fifth-century basilica of Sta. Sabina in Rome (Jensen, *Understanding*, p. 165). Elisha is less often seen, but commonly symbolised with two features: his predecessor’s mantle and his baldness (Murray and Murray, *Oxford Companion*, p. 161). King Solomon does appear later in Christian art, mostly in contexts demonstrating his superior wisdom (Murray and Murray, *Oxford Companion*, p. 498). In the Ethiopic tradition, whose Bible was initially based upon the Greek text, King Solomon married the Queen of Sheba, and their son David returned with his mother to become Menelek I, so that Solomon is essentially the father of the Ethiopic Church.

Bibliography

- Abate, E., *La fine del regno di Sedecia* (TECC 76; Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 2008).
- Bickerman, E., ‘Demetrios the Chronographer’, in J. Neusner (ed.), *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults* (Festschrift M. Smith; Leiden: Brill, 1975), pp. 72–84.
- Bogaert, P.-M., *Apocalypse de Baruch: introduction, traduction du syriaque et commentaire* (Sources chrétiennes 144–145; Paris: Cerf, 1969).
- ‘Compte rendu: D.W. Gooding, *Relics of Ancient Exegesis*’, *RTL* 8 (1978), pp. 95–100.
- Burkitt, F.C., *Fragments of the Books of Kings according to the Translation of Aquila* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1897).
- Deboys, D.G., ‘The Greek Text of 2 Kings’ (M.Litt thesis, University of Oxford, 1981).
- de Lange, N.R.M., *Greek Jewish Texts from the Cairo Genizah* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996), pp. 155–63.
- de Lange, N.R.M., J.G. Krivoruchko and C. Boyd-Taylor (eds.), *Jewish Reception of Greek Bible Versions* (TSMEMJ 23; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009).
- Denis, A.-M., *Introduction aux pseudépigraphes grecs d’Ancien Testament* (Studia in Veteris Testamenti pseudepigrapha 1; Leiden: Brill, 1970).
- Diercks, D.F., *Luciferi Calaritani Opera quae supersunt* (Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina 8; Turnhout: Brepols, 1978).
- Fernández Marcos, N., ‘The Lucianic Text in the Books of Kingdoms: From Lagarde to the Textual Pluralism’, in A. Pietersma and C. Cox (eds.), *De Septuaginta* (Festschrift J.W. Wevers; Mississauga, Ont.: Benben, 1984), pp. 161–74.
- Fernández Marcos, N., and J.R. Busto Saiz (eds.), *Theodoretii Cyrensis Quaestiones in Reges et Paralipomena. Editio Critica* (TECC 32; Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1984).
- Funk, F.X. (ed.), *Didascalica et Constitutiones Apostolorum* (2 vols.; Paderbornae: F. Schoeningh, 1905).
- Gooding, D.W., ‘Problems of Text and Midrash in the Third Book of Reigns’, *Textus* 7 (1969), pp. 1–29.
- Hugo, P., *Les deux visages d’Élie: Texte massorétique et Septante dans l’histoire la plus ancienne de 1 Rois 17–18* (OBO 217; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006).
- ‘Text History of the Books of Samuel: An Assessment of the Recent Research’, in P. Hugo and A. Schenker (eds.), *Archaeology of the Books of Samuel: The Entangling of the Textual and Literary History* (VTSup 132; Leiden: Brill, 2010), pp. 1–19.
- Jensen, R.M., *Understanding Early Christian Art* (London: Routledge, 2000).

- Keulen, P.S.F. van, *Two Versions of the Solomon Narrative: An Inquiry into the Relationship between MT 1 Kgs. 2–11 and LXX 3 Reg. 2–11* (VTSup 104; Leiden: Brill, 2005).
- Kraft, R., ‘Reassessing the Impact of Barthélemy’s *Devanciers*, Forty Years Later’, *BIOSCS* 37 (2004), pp. 1–28.
- Law, T.M., ‘How Not to Use 3 Reigns: A Plea to Scholars of the Books of Kings’, *VT* 61 (2011), pp. 280–97.
- ‘*Kaige*, Aquila, and Jewish Revision’, in T.M. Law and A.G. Salvesen (eds.), *Greek Scripture and the Rabbis: Studies from the European Association of Jewish Studies Seminar, 2010* (CBET; Leuven: Peeters, 2012), pp. 39–64.
- ‘The Use of the Greek Bible in Some Byzantine Jewish Glosses on Solomon’s Building Campaign’, in N. de Lange, J.G. Krivoruchko and C. Boyd-Taylor (eds.), *Jewish Reception of Greek Bible Versions* (TSMEMJ 23; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), pp. 263–83.
- ‘La version syro-hexaplaire et la transmission textuelle de la Bible grecque’, in F. Briquellé-Chatonnet and M. Debie (eds.), *L’Ancien Testament en Syriacque* (Études syriaques 5; Paris: Geuthner, 2008), pp. 101–20.
- Law, T.M., and T. Kauhanen, ‘Methodological Reflections on the Study of Kingdoms: A Response to Siegfried Kreuzer’, *BIOSCS* 43 (2010), pp. 73–88.
- Murray, P., and L. Murray (eds.), *The Oxford Companion to Christian Art and Architecture* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996).
- Petit, F., *Autour de Théodoret de Cyr* (TEG 13; Leuven: Peeters, 2003).
- Petit, F., and L. van Rompay, *Sévère d’Antioche: Fragments grecs tirés des chaînes sur les derniers livres de l’Octateuque et sur les Règnes* (TEG 14; Leuven: Peeters, 2006).
- Piquer, A., P. Torrijano and J. Trebolle Barrera, ‘Septuagint Versions, Greek Recensions and Hebrew Editions: The Text-Critical Evaluation of the Old Latin, Armenian and Georgian Versions in III–IV Regnorum’, in H. Ausloos, J. Cook, F. García Martínez, B. Lemmelijn and M. Vervenne (eds.), *Translating a Translation: The LXX and Its Modern Translations in the Context of Early Judaism* (BETL 213; Leuven: Peeters, 2008), pp. 251–81.
- Sauma, A. (ed.), *Gregory Bar-Hebraeus’ Commentary on the Book of Kings from His Storehouse of Mysteries: A Critical Edition with an English Translation, Introduction and Notes* (Studia Semitica Upsaliensia 20; Uppsala: Uppsala Universitet, 2003).
- Schenker, A., *Älteste Textgeschichte der Königsbücher: Die hebräische Vorlage der ursprünglichen Septuaginta als älteste Textform der Königsbücher* (OBO 199; Fribourg: Academic Press, 2004).
- Septante et texte massorétique dans l’histoire la plus ancienne du texte de 1 Rois 2–14* (CahRB 48; Paris: Gabalda, 2000).

- ‘Die Zwei Erzählungen von Joabs Tod (1 Kön 2:28-34) im Masoretischen Text und in der LXX’, in B.A. Taylor (ed.), *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo, 1998* (SBLSCS 51; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2001), pp. 27–35.
- Shenkel, J.D., *Chronology and Recensional Development in the Greek Text of Kings* (HSM 1; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1968).
- Spottorno, V., ‘Josephus’ Text for 1–2 Kings (3–4 Kingdoms)’, in L. Greenspoon and O. Munnich (eds.), *VIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Paris 1992* (SBLSCS 41; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), pp. 145–52.
- ‘Lexical Variants in the Greek Text of Reigns and Chronicles’, in B.A. Taylor (ed.), *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo, 1998* (SBLSCS 51; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2001), pp. 63–80.
- Talshir, Z., ‘1 Kings and 3 Kingdoms—Origin and Revision: Case Study—The Sins of Solomon (1 Kgs 11)’, *Textus* 21 (2002), pp. 71–105.
- The Alternative Story of the Division of the Kingdom: 3 Kingdoms 12:24a-z* (Jerusalem Biblical Studies 6; Jerusalem: Simor, 1993).
- ‘The Contribution of Diverging Traditions Preserved in the Septuagint to the Literary Criticism of the Bible’, in L. Greenspoon and O. Munnich (eds.), *VIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Paris 1992* (SBLSCS 41; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), pp. 21–40.
- ‘The Image of the Septuagint-Edition of the Book of Kings’, *Tarbiz* 59 (1990), pp. 249–302 [in Hebrew; English summary, I–II].
- ‘Is the Alternate Tradition of the Division of the Kingdom (3 Kgdms 12:24a-z) Non-Deuteronomistic?’, in G.J. Brooke and B. Lindars (eds.), *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings: Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and Its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings, Manchester, 1990* (SBLSCS 33; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), pp. 599–621.
- ‘The Reign of Solomon in the Making: Pseudo-Connections between 3 Kingdoms and Chronicles’, *VT* 50 (2000), pp. 233–49.
- Thackeray, H.St.J., ‘The Greek Translators of the Four Books of Kings’, *JTS* 8 (1907), pp. 262–78.
- Tov, E., ‘Three Strange Books of the LXX: 1 Kings, Esther, and Daniel compared with Similar Rewritten Compositions from Qumran and Elsewhere’, in *Hebrew Bible, Greek Bible, and Qumran* (TSAJ 121; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), pp. 283–305.
- Trebolle Barrera, J., *Centena in Libros Samuelis et Regum. Variantes textuales y composición literaria en los Libros de Samuel y Reyes* (Textos y Estudios ‘Cardinal Cisneros’ de la Biblia Políglota Matritense 47; Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1989).

The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint

- ‘From the *Old Latin*, through the *Old Greek* to the *Old Hebrew* (2 Kings 10:23–25)’, *Textus* 11 (1984), pp. 17–36.
- ‘Old Latin, Old Greek and Old Hebrew in the Books of Kings (1 Ki. 18:27 and 2 Ki. 20:11)’, *Textus* 13 (1986), pp. 85–94.
- ‘The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in the Books of Kings’, in C.E. Cox (ed.), *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Leuven 1989* (SBLSCS 31; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991), pp. 285–99.
- Turkanik, A., *Of Kings and Reigns: A Study of Translation Technique in the Gamma/Gamma Section of 3 Reigns (1 Kings)* (FAT 2/30; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008).
- Van den Eynde, C. (ed.), *Commentaire d’Īsō ‘dad de Merv sur l’Ancien Testament III.1–2: Livres des Sessions* (CSCO 229–230; Scriptorum Syri 96–97; Leuven: Peeters, 1962).
- Wacholder, B.Z., *Eupolemus: A Study of Judaeo-Greek Literature* (HUCM 3; Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College, 1974).
- Wevers, J.W., ‘Exegetical Principles Underlying the Septuagint Text of 1 Kings ii 12–xxi 43’, *OTS* 8 (1950), pp. 300–22.
- ‘Principles of Interpretation Guiding the Fourth Translator of the Books of the Kingdoms (3 K. 22:1–4 K. 25:30)’, *CBQ* 14 (1952), pp. 40–56.
- ‘A Study in the Exegetical Principles Underlying the Greek Text of 2 Sm 11:2–1 Kings 2:11’, *CBQ* 15 (1953), pp. 30–45.

1–2 Chronicles (*Paraleipomena*)

Roger Good

Editions

(a) Standard Greek Editions

Göttingen (none available at present).

Cambridge, vol. II.3, *I and II Chronicles* (Brooke, McLean, and Thackeray, 1932).

Rahlfs-Hanhart, vol. I, pp. 752–810, 811–72.

Swete, vol. II, pp. 1–60, 61–128.

(b) Other Greek Editions

Lucianic tradition, *El Texto Antioqueno*, vol. III (Fernández Marcos and Busto Saiz, 1996).

Vannutelli, *Libri Synoptici Veteris Testamenti* (1931–34).¹

(c) Modern Translations

NETS (Cowe, 2007), pp. 342–67, 368–91.

LXX.D (Labahn and Sängler, 2009), pp. 489–517, 518–50.

La Biblia Griega, vol. II (Fernández Marcos *et al.*, 2011), pp. 429–556.

I. General Characteristics

Chronicles is a narrative history produced during post-exilic times, and it mostly consists of material taken from canonical sources. Samuel–Kings is the most frequent source used (or alternatively, both Chronicles and Samuel–Kings were taken from an earlier common source), in addition to

1. Showing parallel portions of Samuel–Kings and Chronicles in Hebrew (MT) and Reigns and Paraleipomena in Greek (Swete).

some non-canonical sources (e.g., the story of the prophet Iddo—cf. 2 Chron. 13.2-22, about Abijah; and the records of the seers—cf. 2 Chron. 33.11-19, about Manasseh), and work originating from the Chronicler himself.

The name given to the translation of Chronicles in Greek is indicative of how the book was viewed by some in ancient times: *Παραλειπομένων* *Paraleipomenon* ‘of the things left over’ or ‘of the things left out’ (but mostly referred to in scholarly literature as *Paraleipomena*). Chronicles recorded additional content of the genealogical material and narrative history that spans from Genesis to 2 Kings. However, this title fails to draw attention to the other aspect of the content of Chronicles, the rewriting and reworking of earlier ‘biblical’ works.

The Greek Chronicles mostly follows the sequence and content of the Hebrew although it lacks (in Vaticanus B) 1 Chron. 1.11-16, 17b-24a, 27b, and contains additional sections at the end of 2 Chron. 35.19a-d; 36.2a-c, 5a-d. Scholars debate whether these additions (and indeed any variations from the MT) were in the translator’s Hebrew *Vorlage* (Allen, ‘Further Thoughts’, pp. 483–91; *Greek Chronicles*, vol. I, pp. 214–17) or were taken from a Lucianic witness to the Greek book of Reigns (Rehm, *Textkritische*; Shenkel, ‘Comparative’; Klein, ‘Studies’; ‘Supplements’, pp. 492–95).

It seems that the Greek translator or editors were responsible for dividing Chronicles into two portions, concluding 1 Chronicles with the end of David’s reign and beginning 2 Chronicles with Solomon’s reign. Although the books of Chronicles are one of the largest sections of text in the Bible, they are also one of the most neglected portions. Only two small fragments of the books of Chronicles (2 Chron. 28.27–29.3) were preserved at Qumran (4Q118). Chronicles was also probably one of the later books to be translated into Greek.

The translator of Chronicles sometimes borrowed vocabulary and technical terminology from the LXX Pentateuch to assist him in his translation (Allen, *Greek Chronicles*, vol. I, pp. 23–26).

II. Time and Place of Composition

While there has been some debate among scholars as to the exact dating of the Hebrew book of Chronicles, most date the translation of

Chronicles into Greek to the second century B.C.E. prior to the citations of the Greek translation in Eupolemus (ca. 150 B.C.E.). Chronicles was completed sometime in the Persian period, perhaps in the early Persian period (539–460 B.C.E.), with the genealogical material completed no earlier than 400 B.C.E. (cf. 1 Chron. 3.19–24). The genealogical material in *Paraleipomena* (3.21) actually extends the Davidic genealogy by four generations, which would give a *terminus a quo* for the genealogical material as ca. 300 B.C.E. (Klein, *1 Chronicles*, p. 122; Knoppers, *1 Chronicles*, p. 322).

Paraleipomena was probably translated in Egypt, and this could be confirmed by the use of terms from Ptolemaic Egypt, such as *παστοφόριον* (1 Chron. 9.26; 26.16; 28.12) and *καταλύματα* (28.12) for the chambers of the temple, terms also used for the Serapeum, or the temple dedicated to the Greek-Egyptian god Serapis in ancient Alexandria (Allen, *Greek Chronicles*, vol. I, pp. 21–23). However, caution is needed against using some technical terms, such as *διάδοχος* ‘deputy’ or ‘lieutenant’ (1 Chron. 18.17; 2 Chron. 28.7), to prove the Egyptian provenance of the translation (Pearce, ‘Contextualising’, pp. 23–27). It also seems that the translator had some personal knowledge or familiarity with Jerusalem and the Temple, as indicated in some paraphrases; for example, ‘the city gate’ is more clearly defined as the *τῆς πύλης τῆς φάραγγος* ‘the valley gate’ (2 Chron. 32.6), reflecting the geographical reality of Jerusalem (Allen, *Greek Chronicles*, vol. I, pp. 51–52).

III. Language

The language of the translation of Chronicles is Hellenistic Greek (Koine). However, interference from the Hebrew source language may be seen throughout. For example, the translation follows closely the Hebrew word order and has its characteristic propensity for paratactic main clauses rather than a hypotactic mix of main clauses and subordinate clauses or circumstantial participles, more characteristic of non-translation Greek. Certain structures also occur more frequently, such as *καὶ ἐγένετο* for the introductory *וַיְהִי*.

Prepositions are often used in non-standard Greek ways. The translator, for example, renders the Hebrew comparative with *מִן* by the Greek preposition *ὑπέρ*, which does not have the same function in Greek

(1 Chron. 4.9; 11.21; 2 Chron. 21.13; 33.9). In 2 Chron. 30.18 ὑπέρ even stands alone without an object (functioning adverbially?) at the end of a clause.

It seems that the translator was familiar with Aramaic and this influenced the way he translated certain words or structures, perhaps indicative of his spoken language. The Hebrew נצח is rendered by the root ἰσχυ- implying the Aramaic sense of ‘being victorious’ (1 Chron. 15.21; 29.11; cf. Isa. 25.8) compared to the Hebrew ‘lastingness, forever’. A number of words beginning with a נ are translated as infinitives (1 Chron. 15.16; 16.42; 2 Chron. 5.13; 20.22-23), perhaps interpreted as Aramaic infinitives of the type מכתב (Allen, *Greek Chronicles*, vol. I, p. 126).

IV. Translation and Composition

The Greek Chronicles is a very literal translation especially when compared to 1 Esdras (which contains 2 Chron. 35.1–36.23), which is written in elegant and idiomatic Greek (Talshir, *Origin*, p. 269), and to the Pentateuch and Reigns (apart from the *kaige* sections). In the translation of verbs, for example, in the parallel sections with Chronicles, 1 Esdras uses about 14 circumstantial participles to translate coordinated Hebrew verb forms (mostly *wayyiqtol* and *qatal*), whereas *Paraleipomena* uses coordinated indicative Greek forms (mostly aorists). 1 Esdras also uses three historic presents to translate *qatal* forms. In comparison with the Greek Pentateuch, the translation of Chronicles avoids conjunctive circumstantial participles for *wayyiqtol* and other coordinated forms (Good, *The Septuagint's Translation*, pp. 90–91). In contrast to the translation of Samuel–Kings (1–4 Kingdoms) the translator avoided the historical present for the narrative past forms *wayyiqtol* and *qatal* (*The Septuagint's Translation*, p. 222).

The translation of Chronicles follows the Hebrew text closely with a word-for-word representation of the morphology and syntax of the Hebrew source text or *Vorlage*, which was quite close to the MT. However, in certain places it seems that the *Vorlage* of *Paraleipomena* was closer to the Hebrew text of Samuel–Kings (especially the text of Samuel discovered at Qumran, 4QSam^a) than the MT of Chronicles. As far as consistency in translation is concerned the translator sometimes

employed the same Greek word for different Hebrew words and a different Greek word for the same Hebrew words.

The conjunction ו is almost always translated by καί and only occasionally by δέ (2 Chron. 32.8) or ἀλλά (28.2). However, וג is usually also translated simply by καί (1 Chron. 20.6).

In the translation of verbs, some prefix forms (including *wayyiqtol*) are sometimes mechanically translated by Greek futures (1 Chron. 9.28 *bis*; 2 Chron. 5.6). Some *wayyiqtol* and *qatal* forms are translated by Greek imperfects (12.11). Some Hebrew participles are translated by Greek participles, leaving a clause lacking a finite verb (1 Chron. 9.29; 15.27). A few adjectival participles are translated by a finite verb with καί, e.g., מְשִׁיבֵי הַמַּדְרִיבִים translated καὶ ἠγίασαν (2 Chron. 31.6). Very rarely a conjunctive circumstantial participle translates a coordinated finite verb in Hebrew: for example, וַיִּקְדוּ וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ ‘and they bowed their heads and prostrated themselves’ becomes καὶ κάμψαντες τὰ γόνατα προσεκύνησαν ‘and bowing the knees they worshipped’ (1 Chron. 29.20; so also 2 Chron. 20.18).

Sometimes the kind of stereotyping translation employed produced structures that diverge from the norms of Greek syntax. The preposition most commonly employed in translation (over 1,000 times in 1–2 Chronicles), ἐν ‘in’, is frequently and repeatedly used for -ב in most contexts, including places where a Greek instrumental dative case would be more appropriate: ἐν πάσῃ δυνάμει καὶ ἐν ψαλτωδοῖς καὶ ἐν κινύραις καὶ ἐν νάβλαις, ἐν τυμπάνοις καὶ ἐν κυμβάλοις καὶ ἐν σάλπιγγιν (1 Chron. 13.8). This kind of translation produces calques, or the stereotyping of translation equivalents, extending their range beyond what is semantically appropriate in the target language (Cowe, NETS, p. 343). The most frequent way, for example, to translate a Hebrew infinitive preceded by ל following a verb of willing or desiring—as in οὐκ ἠθέλησεν Σύρος τοῦ βοηθῆσαι ‘the Syrians were not willing to help’ (1 Chron. 19.19)—was by τοῦ plus infinitive, whereas standard Greek would ordinarily use a bare infinitive. The pleonastic resumptive pronoun in relative clauses is also frequently translated.

At the same time the translator produces good Greek syntax. Often a repeated noun in Hebrew is translated by a Greek pronoun (considered better Greek style). Sometimes relative clauses with אשר are translated by a genitive or an attributive participle.

The translation contains a number of transliterations, especially for technical terms such as those related to the temple in Jerusalem: *αιλαμ* for the Hebrew אולם ‘porch’ (2 Chron. 3.4), *γωλαθ* and *χωθαρεθ* for גלות ‘bowls’ and כתרות ‘capitals’ (4.12), *χωθαρεθ* for מכנות ‘bases’ (4.14) as well as musical instruments, such as *κινύρα* and *νάβλα* for כנור ‘harp’ and נבל ‘lyre’ (1 Chron. 13.8). Transliteration is also employed frequently for personal and geographical names and for unknown words. Sometimes unknown words were translated by a contextual guess or an appeal to an etymological similarity. Thus, a *hapax legomenon* צעצעים is translated as ἐκ ξύλων (2 Chron. 3.10) perhaps due to the presence of the similar looking צע in v. 5 (Allen, *Greek Chronicles*, vol. I, pp. 59–64).

Sometimes the translator is quite idiomatic and sensitive in his use of Greek words, as in the choice of a classical compound adjective *φιλογέωργος* ‘lover of farming’, also found in Xenophon and Aristophanes, to render the Hebrew phrase אהב אדמה in 2 Chron. 26.10. The double negative οὐ μή is also used eight times for a single Hebrew negative (seven times with a subjunctive, one time with a future—2 Chron. 32.15). The translator also used non-standard equivalent verb tenses such as Greek imperfects and perfects (rather than aorists), being sensitive to contextual discourse features such as iterative adverbials, a change of subject and summary statements (Good, *The Septuagint’s Translation*, pp. 213–15).

V. Key Text-Critical Issues

The most thorough study of the text-critical issues of LXX Chronicles has been by Allen in his dissertation, which was later published in two volumes by Brill (*The Greek Chronicles*). Allen identified four groups of manuscripts among the forty-six manuscripts of *Paraleipomena* that were available to him (*Greek Chronicles*, vol. I, pp. 3, 32–37, 65–108). He identified the most basic text form as text group G, consisting primarily of the B (Vaticanus) and c₂ MSS. Portions of MSS A N f g h i j and m also comprise this group. The other three groups, L, R, and O, correct the G group to the MT. According to Allen, G itself has been extensively revised, so that its fairly close approximation to the MT may stem from the recensional process. The L or Lucianic manuscripts are represented by b and e₂ and sometimes by minuscules f j k g i n y, and

350. They exhibit the usual characteristics of the Lucianic recension (such as adding names, replacing pronouns by names, substituting synonyms and using Atticisms). It is most carefully corrected to the MT. The R group consists of MSS d p q t z and sometimes 44, 8, 74, 122, 125, 144, 236, 246, 314, 321, 346, 610 and j in 1 Chronicles. Occasionally MSS f i m n y and c₂ also share the characteristics of this group. R is corrected to the MT but independent of L. The O or Hexaplaric MSS consist of A N a c e g h n Armenian and the Syro-Hexaplaric recension. Occasionally b f i j m o y 46, 381 and 728 share the characteristics of this group.

None of these text traditions exhibit the features of the *kaige* recension, at least in totality. At most only four (with rare occurrences of four more) of the nineteen characteristics of that recension occur in *Paraleipomena*, such as the elimination of historic presents, οὐκ ἔστιν for אין in past or future time (e.g., 2 Chron. 15.5), and ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς for בעיני (e.g., 1 Chron. 13.4; 2 Chron. 29.8) instead of ἐνώπιον or ἐναντίον, both used twelve to thirteen times respectively (Allen, *Greek Chronicles*, vol. I, pp. 137–41).

VI. Ideology and Exegesis

The ideology of the book of Chronicles, which privileges the Temple, David and the Levites, is carried into the translation. Perhaps the translation was felt appropriate for the particular historical circumstances current around the time of translation—the Maccabean revolt against the Syrian king Antiochus IV that lasted from 180 B.C.E. until 161 B.C.E. At the end of the period, after the rebels had conquered Judah and Jerusalem, the Temple was re-dedicated. Perhaps the translator was sympathetic to the restored Temple, the Hasmonean dynasty and the priesthood in Jerusalem current at the time of translation. The fact that very little of Chronicles is preserved at Qumran could indicate that the Qumran community identified the message of the book with the Hasmonean ruling class in Jerusalem and the Temple.

Allen cautions against detecting theological bias in the translator. The apparent avoidance of anthropomorphisms, such as כפי יהוה translated κατὰ τὸν λόγον κυρίου ‘according to the word of the Lord’ (1 Chron. 12.24[23]), is counterbalanced by other examples to the contrary, where the expression פי is rendered literally στόμα ‘mouth’ (2 Chron. 35.22; 36.12).

VII. Reception History

Paraleipomena was used by two Hellenistic Jewish historians who both wrote in Greek—Eupolemus, who wrote around 150 B.C.E., and Josephus, who wrote around 93–94 C.E. Fragments of Eupolemus’s work *On the Kings in Judea* incorporate details from Chronicles/*Paraleipomena* not mentioned in Kings. He also preferred to quote Chronicles over Kings in parallel passages since the history of Chronicles accorded more with the emphasis of his history. It is uncertain whether Josephus used the Hebrew text or Greek translation (or both) as a source for his *Jewish Antiquities*. He tended to use Kings as a base but supplemented his history from Chronicles in non-parallel texts. Occasionally, he prefers the accounts of Chronicles over Kings. He overlooked contradictions, harmonised and combined some accounts (Kalimi, *Retelling*, pp. 93–97). Philo, who mostly quoted from the Pentateuch in his writings, did not quote from Chronicles once.

After early Christians adopted the Greek translation as their Old Testament, the Jewish interpreters avoided using the Old Greek text, including Chronicles. Material unique to *Paraleipomena* is not quoted in the New Testament, and there are perhaps only two quotes that are used in the New Testament that are from Chronicles, but they also occur in other parts of the Old Testament. The expression *ὡς πρόβατα οἷς οὐκ ἔστιν ποιμήν* ‘like sheep who have no shepherd’ (2 Chron. 18.16) is reflected in the Gospels *ὡσεὶ πρόβατα μὴ ἔχοντα ποιμένα* (Mt. 9.36; Mk 6.34) and also occurs in Num. 27.17 as *ὡσεὶ πρόβατα οἷς οὐκ ἔστιν ποιμήν*. The expression *ἐγὼ ἔσομαι αὐτῷ εἰς πατέρα, καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσται μοι εἰς υἱόν* ‘I will be a father to him, and he shall be a son to me’ (1 Chron. 17.13) is quoted in Heb. 1.5, but it also occurs in the parallel passage in 2 Sam. 7.14. The association of Israelites with God-fearers in Acts 13.16 (cf. 10.2 Gentiles) perhaps alludes to *πᾶσα συναγωγή Ἰσραηλ καὶ οἱ φοβούμενοι* (the second phrase being a Greek plus) who were both present at the dedication of Solomon’s temple (2 Chron. 5.6). The death of Zechariah, the son of Jehoiada (2 Chron. 24.20–22), is perhaps referred to in Mt. 23.35 (which refers to Zechariah as the son of Barachiah, Zech. 1.1) and Lk. 11.51. However, there is some question as

to whether the Gospels refer to the prophet Zechariah the son of Berechiah or whether there was some confusion between the two. In either case the writers of the Gospels mention murders that span from the beginning of the biblical record (Abel) to the end, either canonically or chronologically. The Gospels also specify that Zechariah died between the altar and the temple whereas Chronicles states he was stoned to death in the court of the house of the Lord (2 Chron. 24.21). Other places where Chronicles is alluded to (but not necessarily exclusively) are the Queen of Sheba (2 Chron. 9.1), referred to as the queen of the south (Mt. 12.42), and the course of Abijah (Lk. 1.5; cf. 1 Chron. 24.10).

Paraleipomena (the Old Greek/LXX) was used as the base text for the translation of a number of ancient versions, including the Old Latin, Armenian, and Ethiopic versions. These versions witness to different stages of the transmission of *Paraleipomena*, with the latter two based on the L family of MSS, as is Josephus and Theodoret.

Greek church fathers such as Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus, Justin Martyr and Origen rarely commented on or quoted from *Paraleipomena*, mostly in conjunction with comments on Samuel–Kings, focusing on passages where typological and allegorical or literal and moral interpretation were possible. Theodoret of Cyrus is the author of the only extant Greek commentary of 1–2 Chronicles. His *Quaestiones in Octateuchum* on Genesis through Ruth and *Quaestiones in Reges et Paralipomena* deal specifically with questions and answers on the biblical text. However, by the time he got to *Paraleipomena*, the questions are replaced by a commentary! Nevertheless, this is not a systematic commentary; Theodoret concentrates on clarifying and explaining difficult or unclear passages. Coming from the Antiochian school, he follows a literal interpretation with expanded typological components concerning Christ. Eusebius of Caesarea (ca. 263–340) and Pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite (early sixth century) both comment on 2 Chron. 26.16–23. John of Damascus (ca. 670–749) is apologetic and pays attention to the moral content of the biblical passage as seen in his comment on 1 Chron. 28.3 (Conti, *1–2 Kings*, pp. xxvi–xxvii).

Bibliography

- Allen, L.C., 'Further Thoughts on an Old Recension of Reigns in Paralipomena', *HTR* 61 (1968), pp. 483–91.
- The Greek Chronicles: The Relation of the Septuagint of I and II Chronicles to the Massoretic Text. Part I: The Translator's Craft; Part II: Textual Criticism* (VTSup 25, 27; Leiden: Brill, 1974).
- Conti, M., *1–2 Kings, 1–2 Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther* (Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture: Old Testament 5; Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2008).
- Cowe, S.P., '1 and 2 Supplements', in R. Hiebert and B.G. Wright (eds.), *Society of Biblical Literature Commentary on the Septuagint* (forthcoming).
- 'To the Reader of 1 and 2 Supplements' and English Translation of 1–2 Supplements', in A. Pietersma and B.G. Wright (eds.), *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), pp. 342–91.
- Fernández Marcos, N., and J.R. Busto Saiz (eds.), *El Texto Antioqueno de la Biblia griega III: 1–2 Crónicas* (TECC 60; Madrid: Instituto de Filología del CSIC, 1996).
- Theodreti Cyrensis Quaestiones in Reges et Paralipomena* (Editio critica; TECC 32; Madrid: de la Biblia Poliglota Matritense Instituto 'Arias Montano' CSIC, 1984).
- Gerleman, G., *Studies in the Septuagint II: Chronicles* (Lunds Universitets Årsskrift 43/3; Lund: Gleerup, 1946).
- Good, R., *The Septuagint's Translation of the Hebrew Verbal System in Chronicles* (VTSup 136; Leiden: Brill, 2010).
- Kalimi, I., *The Reshaping of Ancient Israelite History* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2005).
- The Retelling of Chronicles in Jewish Tradition and Literature: A Historical Journey* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2009).
- Klein, R.W., *1 Chronicles: A Commentary* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006).
- 'Studies in the Greek Texts of the Chronicler' (Th.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1966).
- 'Supplements in the Paralipomena: A Rejoinder', *HTR* 61 (1968), pp. 492–95.
- Knoppers, G.N., *1 Chronicles 1–9: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 12A; New York: Doubleday, 2003).
- Knoppers, G.N., and P.B. Harvey, 'Omitted and Remaining Matters: On the Names Given to the Book of Chronicles in Antiquity', *JBL* 121 (2002), pp. 227–43.
- Pearce, S., 'Contextualising Greek Chronicles', in S. Berger, M. Brocke, and I. Zwiép (eds.), *Zutot 2001* (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic, 2002), pp. 22–27.
- Rehm, M., *Textkritische Untersuchungen zu den Parallelstellen der Samuel-Königsbücher und der Chronik* (Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen 13/3; Münster: Aschendorff, 1937).
- Rogers, V.M., 'The Old Greek Version of Chronicles: A Comparative Study of the LXX with the Hebrew Text from a Theological Approach' (Ph.D. dissertation, Princeton Theological Seminary, 1954).

1–2 Chronicles (Paraleipomena)

- Shenkel, J.D., 'A Comparative Study of the Synoptic Parallels in I Paraleipomena and I-II Reigns', *HTR* 62 (1969), pp. 63–85.
- Talshir, Z., *I Esdras: From Origin to Translation* (SBLSCS 47; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1999).
- Vannutelli, P. (ed.), *Libri Synoptici Veteris Testamenti: Seu Librorum Regum Et Chronicorum Loci Paralleli Quos Hebraice, Graece Et Latine Critice* (Romae: Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1931–34).

1 Esdras

Hector M. Patmore

Editions

(a) Standard Greek Editions

Göttingen, vol. VIII.1, *Esdrae liber I* (Hanhart, 1974).¹

Cambridge, vol. II.4, *Esdras, Ezra–Nehemiah* (Brooke, McLean, and Thackeray, 1935).

Rahlfs-Hanhart, vol. I, pp. 873–902.²

Swete, vol. II, pp. 129–61.

(b) Modern Translations

NETS (Wooden, 2007), pp. 392–404.

LXX.D (Böhler, 2009), pp. 552–66.

La Biblia Griega, vol. II (Fernández Marcos *et al.*, 2011), pp. 557–90.

I. General Characteristics

a. Title

The title ‘Esdras’ (Ἔσδρας, a rendering into Greek of the Hebrew עזרא ‘Ezra’) is used to designate a number of different works. The work known as ‘2 Esdras’ or Ἔσδρας β’ in the LXX contains the biblical books of Ezra and Nehemiah, while the title ‘1 Esdras’ or Ἔσδρας α’ refers to an apocryphal work containing material with parallels to the books of

1. In Hanhart’s discussion of earlier diplomatic and critical editions (pp. 26–31), he acknowledged Rahlfs’ 1935 edition to be the foundation for his edition, while criticising him for having attached too much importance to the witness of Codex Vaticanus (pp. 30–31).

2. The verse numbering differs between Rahlfs-Hanhart and Hanhart’s Göttingen editions, leading to discrepancy in the secondary literature and translations. Göttingen enumeration is followed here.

Ezra, Nehemiah, and 2 Chronicles, and a quantity of material not known from other sources. Confusion arises from the Vulgate, where the current work is entitled 3 Esdras, and in Slavonic Bibles 2 Esdras. Most English-language scholarship refers to this work as ‘1 Esdras’, whereas German-speaking scholars generally prefer the title ‘3 Esra’.

b. Summary of Contents

1 Esdras in its current form is a complete and self-contained narrative (not apparently a compilation or anthology). The narrative begins with Josiah’s celebration of the Passover, his death, and the reigns of his successors until the exile under Zedekiah (1.1-58). The remainder of the work can be summarised as follows:

1. the decree of Cyrus II encouraging the rebuilding of the temple in Jerusalem and the response of the people (558–530 b.c.e., 2.1-14);
2. opposition to and cessation of rebuilding in the time of Artaxerxes I (465–424 b.c.e., 2.15-25);
3. the competition between the three bodyguards of King Darius I (522–486 b.c.e.), which results in Darius formally sanctioning rebuilding (3.1–5.6);
4. the return and settlement in Jerusalem (5.7-45);
5. the beginning of rebuilding work (5.46-70);
6. the right to rebuild questioned by local officials and officially affirmed by Darius I (6.1-33);
7. the completion and dedication of the temple (7.1-15);
8. the return (on the authority of Artaxerxes) and ministry of Ezra (8.1–9.55).

The text exhibits the following parallels to material found in 2 Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah:

1 Esdras	=	MT
1 Esd. 1.1-20	=	2 Chron. 35.1-19
1 Esd. 1.21-22	=	no parallel
1 Esd. 1.23-55	=	2 Chron. 35.20–36.21
1 Esd. 2.1-5	=	Ezra 1.1-3 (cf. 2 Chron. 36.22-23)
1 Esd. 2.6-14	=	Ezra 1.4-11
1 Esd. 2.15-25	=	Ezra 4.7-24
1 Esd. 3.1–5.6	=	no parallel (the three bodyguards)
1 Esd. 5.7-70	=	Ezra 2.1–4.5 (cf. Neh. 7.7-73)
1 Esd. 6.1–9.36	=	Ezra 5.1–10.44
1 Esd. 9.37-55	=	Neh. 7.72–8.13a

II. Time and Place of Composition

The relation of 1 Esdras to the canonical books (and consequently the value it might have as a text-critical tool) is dependent upon one's understanding of the work's composition. Several features must be taken into account. First, the text contains many variants from the canonical material, varying in size, nature, and distribution. No clear pattern is discernible in the variants that might allow for an ideological or stylistic explanation for the whole. Secondly, the ordering of some of the material is different from the canonical ordering. Finally, the work contains material not found in the canonical books, and the source of this material is unknown.

The task of accounting for these features is further complicated by (a) the lack of an extant Semitic *Vorlage* to the complete work on the one hand, and (b) the sophisticated and fluent nature of the Greek on the other, which calls into question the identification of underlying Semitic sources. Taken together these factors suggest that the current Greek text contains a mixture of both translational and compositional elements.

Scholarly opinion on the composition of 1 Esdras can be divided into three main positions.³

a. Priority of 1 Esdras

This view holds that the text of 1 Esdras reflects an older version of those texts that we now find in the canonical books of Ezra, Nehemiah and Chronicles (with the story of the three bodyguards usually considered secondary). On this view the text is highly significant in text-critical terms and for our understanding of the development of the Chronistic History. It is often referred to as the 'fragment' hypothesis: 1 Esdras is seen as a fragment of a larger work by the 'Chronicler', which included versions of Ezra–Nehemiah and Chronicles.

Classically expressed by Torrey (*Ezra Studies*, pp. 11–36), this view is no longer widely held, though Böhler (*Die heilige Stadt*), Schenker ('La Relation'), Fulton and Knoppers ('Lower Criticism'), and Carr (*The Formation*, pp. 78–82) have recently sought to defend it by pointing

3. For a more detailed survey and a comprehensive bibliography see Pohlmann (*Studien*, pp. 14–26); Böhler (*Die heilige Stadt*, pp. 4–14); De Troyer ('Zerubabel').

to features that are more easily understood as a reworking or embellishment (in particular of material from the Nehemiah Memoir) of the sources underlying 1 Esdras than *vice versa*. Pohlmann (*Studien*) is essentially also of this view, although he considered the ordering to have been disturbed when the story of the three bodyguards was added, so that Ezra 1–6 preserves the original ordering, while 1 Esdras preserves the original form of the material.

Grabbe (*Ezra–Nehemiah*; ‘Chicken or Egg’) has proposed a variation on this view. He sees 1 Esdras as representing an earlier stage of the two foundation stories—that of Zerubbabel and Joshua, and that of Ezra—from which the compiler of the Hebrew Ezra–Nehemiah also drew (taking the story of the three bodyguards and the 2 Chron. 35–36 material to be later additions; *Ezra–Nehemiah*, p. 115). On this view both Ezra–Nehemiah and 1 Esdras represent developments from a common earlier source.

On somewhat different grounds, by analogy with the two text-types of Jeremiah, Cross (‘Reconstruction’; cf. Klein, ‘Old Readings’) also adopted the position that the text preserved in 1 Esdras reflected an earlier and shorter text. Cross considered 1 Esdras to represent an earlier Egyptian text-type that suffered reordering, conflation, and expansion in its Palestinian recension (reflected in MT and 4QEzra).

b. Priority of Hebrew Ezra–Nehemiah

On this view 1 Esdras is a secondary (and therefore later) compilation of excerpts from Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles (or versions thereof), with additional material, which is either original to the author/compiler or is drawn from other unknown sources.

Williamson is a leading proponent of this position (*Israel*; a reassessment of the arguments in light of new research was offered in ‘Problem’). Williamson advanced several convincing arguments in support of his position. First, he rejected the view that Ezra–Nehemiah formed part of the work of the Chronicler, a view fundamental to the ‘fragment’ hypothesis (Williamson, *Israel; 1 and 2 Chronicles; Ezra, Nehemiah*; cf. Japhet, *I & II Chronicles*, pp. 3–7 and references there). Secondly, he argued that the ‘fragment’ hypothesis necessitated that two translations of the same text (albeit in different text-types) had been created around the same time (mid-second century B.C.E.) and in the same location

(Alexandria), which seems unlikely. Thirdly, he argued that the ordering of the material witnessed in 1 Esdras must in a number of cases be secondary to the combining of the accounts of Ezra and Nehemiah (see Williamson, *Israel*, pp. 29–36; ‘Problem’, pp. 204–12). Finally, Williamson adopted (tentatively) the conclusions of Van der Kooij (§ V), rejecting the prevailing view that the abrupt ending of 1 Esdras indicated that some of the text had been lost (see Williamson, ‘Problem’, pp. 208–10).

Two objections to this position are commonly raised. First, it is unclear what motive there would be creating a partial account if Ezra–Nehemiah already existed (see, e.g., Fulton and Knoppers, ‘Lower Criticism’). And secondly, if the compiler knew the Hebrew Ezra–Nehemiah, why would he go to the trouble of omitting Nehemiah? (e.g., Grabbe, *Ezra–Nehemiah*, p. 110).

Williamson (‘Problem’, pp. 215–16; ‘Rewritten Bible?’) has addressed the first of these objections by suggesting that 1 Esdras might be considered ‘rewritten Bible’. Numerous motives for rewriting Ezra–Nehemiah have been proposed, either to advance a certain ideology, such as enhancing Zerubbabel’s position (Fried, ‘Why the Story?’; VanderKam, ‘Literary Questions’), or to smooth out chronological or other problems in the canonical text (Williamson, ‘Rewritten Bible?’; Pakkala, ‘Why 1 Esdras’).

Talshir (*Origin*) has sought to address both these objections by proposing an alternative explanation of the work’s composition. She has argued that the competition between the three bodyguards (1 Esd. 3.1–5.6) provides the *raison d’être* of the entire work, the remainder forming a narrative framework composed of material lifted from (a continuous) Chronicles–Ezra history (cf. also Becking, ‘The Story’). In text-critical terms she believes that both the MT and the *Vorlage* of 1 Esdras experienced omissions as well as additions in the processes of transmission, to the extent that a shorter *Urtext* can no longer be recovered by comparing the two sources.

Talshir’s compositional hypothesis is open to question on the grounds that (a) it fails to account adequately for the inclusion of the remainder of the material; and, (b) the hypothesis that Chronicles–Ezra formed a continuous whole (against Japhet and Williamson) prior to the composition of 1 Esdras is not well supported by her conclusions. Nonetheless,

the position of both Talshir and Williamson that the current shape of the book can be explained in ideological terms is probably correct.

In *BHQ* Marcus has adopted the position that 1 Esdras is a 'later revision' of the parallel material, though still a 'constant witness' to the text (Marcus, *Ezra and Nehemiah*, p. 10) and therefore of text-critical value in specific instances (if used judiciously).

c. Mediating Positions

The hypothesis offered by Eskenazi ('Chronicler'; *In an Age of Prose*) falls somewhere between these two broad 'schools' of thought. On the view that Chronicles and Ezra–Nehemiah never formed a single work, Eskenazi has argued that 1 Esdras was composed by the Chronicler himself (or his school) using Ezra–Nehemiah as his major source and re-working the material to bring it into conformity with the ideology and style of the book of Chronicles. It may be doubted, however, whether the ideological similarities between 1 Esdras and Chronicles offer sufficiently strong grounds to demonstrate common authorship.

d. Dating

The majority of scholars reckon on a translation date sometime in the mid-second century B.C.E., and locate the translation in Alexandria. The distinctive vocabulary of the work (§ IV), particularly its correspondence to that of the second-century B.C.E. compositions of Sirach, Judith, Esther, 1 Maccabees and the Old Greek of Daniel strengthens this view. Features in the narrative of the competition between the three bodyguards may also point to this historical and geographical context (Harvey, 'Darius' Court').

Based on such linguistic data and other features of the text, Myers (*I and II Esdras*, pp. 14–15), Gardner ('Purpose') and Attridge ('Historiography', p. 160) raise the possibility that the work is a response to specific historical situations (respectively: the promotion of a Jewish institution in the period of Seleucus IV or Antiochus IV; the Maccabean crisis, and the conflicts between the Jerusalem temple and its rivals). If the work is actually a translation from a Semitic original, however, this possibility would require that the composition and translation were more or less contemporary.

If one accepts the priority of 1 Esdras, then the task of dating the work becomes entangled in the vexed dating of the Chronistic materials. If one accepts the view that 1 Esdras is a secondary compilation, as seems more likely, then the work was composed sometime after the combining of the Ezra and Nehemiah materials and prior to its translation into Greek, probably sometime in the third or first half of the second century B.C.E.

III. Language

1 Esdras is distinct from the majority of LXX books, although it exhibits an obvious similarity to LXX-Esther, LXX-Daniel, and the books of the Maccabees. Distinctive terminology, such as that relating to the temple (e.g., ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς ‘high priest’, ἱερωσύνη ‘priesthood’, θυρωροί ‘gate-keepers’), including use of τὸ ἱερόν to render the Hebrew formula בית אלהים / בית אלהא / בית יהוה (an equivalent not found in the canonical books of the LXX, which favour ὁ οἶκος τοῦ κυρίου), to official correspondence (προσπίπτειν ‘to receive a document’; ὑποκείμεναι ‘which follows’ or ‘which is appended’; ὑπογράφειν ‘to be copied below’), and to royal administration (φίλοι ‘king’s counsels’; ἀναδεικνύειν ‘to crown [as king]’), and neologisms (εἰδώλιον ‘idol temple’), reflect similar usage to the books of Maccabees, other apocryphal works, and various epigraphic sources, which suggests a linguistic milieu from the last centuries B.C.E.

How much the translator made use of the wider LXX corpus as a guide for his translation is debated. Pohlmann, for example, reckons on little or no use, seeing the translator as ‘experimenting’ with finding appropriate language (Pohlmann, *Esra-Buch*, pp. 378–80), while Talshir sees the language as firmly rooted in the LXX, although her evidence in support of this claim is rather thin (Talshir, *Origin*, p. 248). Semitic interference particularly in the story of the three bodyguards (Talshir, *Origin*, p. 83; Talshir and Talshir, ‘Original Language’) suggests Aramaic over Hebrew as the original language for that section at least.

IV. Translation and Composition

Uncertainty over the likely *Vorlage* of the text has led to a number of different scenarios being suggested concerning the literary growth of the

text and the stage at which the material was translated into Greek. In general terms two answers have been given: either the Greek text of 1 Esdras is principally translation; or, the text is dependent on earlier Greek sources. The former view (translation) is held by most scholars, who consider the Greek text to be a translation of a Hebrew and/or Aramaic source(s). Those adopting the latter view (compilation) suggest that the current text is based on earlier Greek rendition(s), specifically the Greek book of Ezra–Nehemiah (Keil, *Books of Ezra*; Carrez, ‘1. Esdras’), or is a fragment of a Greek translation of the relevant sections of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles (e.g., Pfeiffer, *History*, p. 249), although this view is not widely held.

An analysis of the translation technique is inevitably based on a hypothetical reconstructed source, and this problem is particularly acute in the case of 1 Esdras since its source is less certain and the translator’s style freer. Some variants clearly relate to the nature of the target-language (and are therefore plausibly attributed to the translator), but in the majority of cases it cannot be determined with certainty whether individual features result from the translator or his *Vorlage*. The important work of Talshir has attempted to differentiate between these two possibilities by examining many individual examples in their specific contexts (Talshir, *Origin*, pp. 181–268).

It is universally agreed that the writing style of 1 Esdras produces elegant, fluent Greek. As a consequence the work is justifiably understood to display a looser relationship to its source text than is found in the parallel passages in LXX. The choice of vocabulary and syntax generally follows Greek conventions rather than exhibiting interference from the Hebrew/Aramaic. This suggests that 1 Esdras might be intended as a self-contained narrative for a Greek audience.

The text generally translates the implied sense rather than the literal sense, taking an entire phrase or syntactical unit as its starting point and translating *ad sensum* rather than *ad verbum*. Such an approach naturally results, for example, in the reordering of words and expansions or contractions, so that the translation appears at times rather paraphrastic.

In some instances it appears that the translator takes the opportunity to translate what he considered the implied sense to be even though the base text makes sense when taken literally. A simple example can be found in 1 Esd. 9.45. Here Ezra is ‘seated with honour/honourably (*ἐπιδόξως*) in

front of everyone' when he takes up the book of the law, whereas in the MT he is merely 'above all the people (בִּי־מַעַל כָּל־הָעָם הִיָּה)' (Neh. 8.5). In MT, Ezra is positioned above the people physically (on the wooden platform mentioned in the preceding verse, Neh. 8.4), whereas in 1 Esdras his elevation becomes a matter of status.

Minor variants, such as changes to the voice of a verb (generally active into passive: e.g., 1 Esd. 8.3 τῷ ἐκδεδομένῳ ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ / Ezra 7.6 אֲשֶׁר נָתַן יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל), singular verses plural nouns (e.g., 1 Esd. 1.52 / 2 Chron. 36.19), and the addition or omission of articles, pronouns, and conjunctions (e.g., 1 Esd. 2.20 / Ezra 4.16; 1 Esd. 9.4 / Ezra 10.8) are all frequent and affect word order and number. In the majority of instances these types of features are best explained as resulting from the translator's style or as necessitated by the conventions of his target-language.

Similarly, examples can be found of the translator rendering two lexemes with a single lexeme, for example, where a Hebrew idiom would be tautologous in Greek were all its component lexemes rendered (e.g., ἐβοήθησαν 1 Esd. 2.8 / חזקו בידיהם Ezra 1.6; ἐφ' ἐκάστου πυλῶνος 1 Esd. 1.15 / לשער ושער 2 Chron. 35.15), as well as cases of rendering a single lexeme by two lexemes (e.g., 1.39, 51; 6.14, 15), although the criteria for identifying such usage are problematic. The reversal of word-pair ordering (e.g., 'the people and the priests' / 'the priests and the people'; 'gold and silver' / 'silver and gold', 'name + the king' / 'the king + name') is also frequent.

The translator also repeatedly uses hypotactic constructions (employing a subordinate clause) in place of paratactic constructions (καὶ ἀναβὰς...οἰκοδομῶ 1 Esd. 2.5 / ויעל...ויבן Ezra 1.3; καὶ ἀναστὰς... εἶπεν 1 Esd. 9.7 / ויאמר...ויקם Ezra 10.10), accounting for the loss of the conjunction in a number of cases.

The extent to which the work exhibits traces of a Semitic original is a matter of debate. There are few genuine Semitisms, which probably indicates that the writer was sophisticated enough not to leave such linguistic anachronisms in his work, rather than suggesting that he was working from a non-Semitic source (though see § III above). Normal Semitic constructions are commonly smoothed out in translation: for example, supplying the verb 'to be' where the Hebrew idiom does not

require it (1 Esd. 1.24 Τί ἐμοί καὶ σοί ἐστιν = מִה-לִּי וְלָךְ 2 Chron. 35.21); alterations of word-order of the genitive constructions to form a preposed construction (τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ νόμον 1 Esd. 8.21 / טעם אלה 1 Esd. 7.23; τῆς Δαρείου βασιλείας 1 Esd. 5.70 / מלכות דריוש Ezra 4.5); and the use of translation equivalents that reflect the transferred or idiomatic sense of a word(s) in its source-language, rather than its primary sense (e.g., καὶ ἐκήρυξεν 1 Esd. 2.2 / ויעבר קול Ezra 1.1).

Some of the Semitisms that do appear, such as εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τοῦ αἰῶνος (1 Esd. 4.38), might be explained as the retention of customary religious language, comparable to the retention of the Hebrew צבאות, for example, with titular force in Greek (Σαβαωθ) and targumic Aramaic.

The author is apparently not consistent in his choice of translation equivalents (e.g., שרים is translated with οἱ μεγιστᾶνες, οἱ ἡγούμενοι, οἱ προηγούμενοι, and οἱ προκαθήμενοι), though in some word-categories, such as technical terms (e.g., סופר / נתנים / שורעים / משוררים), he displays greater consistency. In some cases there are obvious stylistic or contextual reasons for so doing, for example, to avoid tedious repetition (e.g., θυσίας... ὀλοκαυτώματα... 1 Esd. 5.49 / עלות... עלות Ezra 3.3).

For a more detailed discussion of the translation technique the reader is referred to the works of Talshir (*Origin*, pp. 181–268), Böhler (‘Übersetzungstechnik’), and Moulton (‘Überlieferung’) in the first instance.

V. Key Text-Critical Issues

Regardless of the view one takes on the composition of 1 Esdras, no generalities concerning its text-critical value as a whole are possible. In those sections of text with parallels in 1 Esdras we find examples of apparent agreement between LXX and MT against 1 Esdras, between 1 Esdras and MT against LXX, and a number of independent variants. Consequently, while text-critical conclusions can be reached in specific instances, it is not possible to extrapolate from these generally applicable principles. The following few examples should highlight some of the problems and important instances, but cannot hope to be comprehensive.

a. Chronicles

The Chronicles material found in 1 Esdras poses a complex challenge. The Chronicler employed the books of Kings as a source. While some variants from Kings may be explained as the Chronicler's 'free' use of his sources, evidence from Qumran and the LXX suggest that a variant *Vorlage* is also probable. A secondary problem is that at some stage the LXX of 2 Chronicles (or its *Vorlage*) has absorbed varying amounts of contamination from parallel texts in Samuel and Kings. In short, it is difficult to establish the text of Chronicles from which 1 Esdras can be judged to have varied. Two examples should help demonstrate this situation.

1 Esdras 1.23 reads, 'Pharaoh, king of Egypt, went to wage war *in Carchemish on the Euphrates* (ἐν Χαρκαμὺς ἐπὶ τοῦ Εὐφράτου)', which closely reflects the wording of the MT (2 Chron. 35.20), 'Neco, King of Egypt, went up to fight *in Carchemish on the Euphrates* (בכרכמיש על-פרת)'. LXX 2 Chron. 35.20, on the other hand, reads 'Pharaoh Nechao, king of Egypt, went up *against the king of the Assyrians to the river Euphrates* (ἐπὶ τὸν βασιλέα Ἀσσυρίων ἐπὶ τὸν ποταμὸν Εὐφράτην)'. This wording reflects that of 2 Kgs 23.29 (MT and LXX), where the same events are recounted, suggesting that in this case the text of LXX 2 Chronicles has been revised towards the parallel text in Kings, whilst 1 Esdras and MT preserve the 'uncontaminated' reading. As I cautioned above, this conclusion is applicable only to the specific wording under consideration (in italics), and not to the verse as a whole.

A more involved example can be found in the case of 1 Esd. 1.21-22, which has no parallel in the MT. The section appears in the material paralleled to 2 Chronicles 35 (between vv. 19 and 20). This material may reflect an earlier text of Chronicles, although Dillard (*2 Chronicles*, pp. 285–86), for example, has advanced another explanation. The material appears to be a paraphrase of 2 Kgs 23.24-27. The material from 2 Kgs 23.24-27 is not found in MT Chronicles but does appear in LXX 2 Chronicles (35.19a-d). On this basis Dillard argued that both 1 Esdras and LXX 2 Chronicles were using a *Vorlage* of Chronicles containing this secondary material (1 Esdras having reworked the material to fit his purposes). Dillard also took this as evidence that 1 Esdras was not a fragment of a larger work, but a later composition (*2 Chronicles*, p. 286).

b. Ezra

A similar though less multifaceted problem arises in the case of material from 1 Esdras paralleled in Ezra, where this material also has parallels with material found in Nehemiah. The section 1 Esd. 5.7-45 (= Ezra 2.1-70), which contains a long list of names and numbers of those who returned from exile, exemplifies this problem, as it contains a great number of variations between MT, LXX, 1 Esdras and parallels in Nehemiah (Neh. 7.6-73). This intricate problem can be illustrated by two examples:

- a) The addition in 1 Esd. 5.15-16 which has been accepted as resting on an authentic *Vorlage* (e.g., *BHS*, ad Ezra 2.16), based on the sequence of names in Neh. 10.18;
- b) Ezra 2.45-46 / 1 Esd. 5.30, where בני עקוב בני חגב 'sons of Akkub, sons of Hagab' was apparently omitted in the Nehemiah list (Neh. 7.48) owing to parablepsis (from חגבה to חגב, see Ezra 2.45-46), and 1 Esdras reads two additions in the names (οἱ Οὐτά, οἱ Κητάβ) after עקוב (Ακούδ), leaving the question of the original form of the list unanswered.

Another point which has attracted text-critical interest is 1 Esdras's alternative to the (apparently) anachronistic reference to Artaxerxes (and Xerxes) in Ezra 4.6–23. As is well known, Ezra 4.6-23 places Xerxes and Artaxerxes between Cyrus and Darius, though both reigned after Darius. In 1 Esdras, the material concerning Xerxes and Artaxerxes appears at 1 Esd. 2.15-25, in a shorter form in which Xerxes has disappeared and the names of the authors are conflated. This resolves the interrupted sequence in the Ezra text (so that Ezra 4.5 = 1 Esd. 5.70 is followed directly by Ezra 5.1 = 1 Esd. 6.1), but its new position in 1 Esdras makes the chronological situation no better. The letter of complaint to Artaxerxes is still placed between Cyrus and Darius. Furthermore in 1 Esdras it now halts the building of the *temple* (i.e. before it has even begun, 1 Esd. 2.17), whereas in Ezra the letter relates only to the rebuilding of the *city* (Ezra 4.12). Even if the priority of 1 Esdras is accepted, the value of 1 Esdras in this instance is questionable.

c. Nehemiah

The current ending of 1 Esdras has attracted much attention. As it stands the work ends somewhat abruptly with *καὶ ἐπισυνήχθησαν* ‘and they were gathered together’. This appears to reflect **וַיִּסְבְּבוּ** of the following verse (Neh. 8.13). The remainder of the text, apparently lost, would most naturally have extended to Neh. 8.18, with the Festival of Tabernacles forming a fitting *inclusio* corresponding to the Passover at 1 Esdras 1 (Grabbe, *Ezra–Nehemiah*, p. 112; Talshir, *Origin*, p. 7). Attempts have been made to restore the ‘missing’ text from a few LXX manuscripts, some Vulgate editions, and also Josephus (*Ant.* 11.154–57; see Van der Kooij, ‘Ending’, pp. 40–44, *contra* Pohlmann, *Studien*, pp. 109–11).

Van der Kooij (‘Ending’; ‘Frage’) has approached the problem from a different angle. He argued that the current form of the ending adheres to the conventions of Greek syntax, and so cannot be considered incomplete in its Greek form (only in the supposed Hebrew form). He argues that *καὶ ἐπισυνήχθησαν* forms part of an *ὅτι*- clause, structured with a double *καὶ* (‘not only...but also...’), which he translates ‘not only because the teaching given them had been instilled to their mind, but also because they had gathered together’ (Van der Kooij, ‘Ending’, p. 45). Eskenazi (‘Chronicler’, pp. 56–59) and Gardner (‘Purpose’, p. 19) have also defended the view that the current ending of the text is deliberate.

d. Evidence from the Dead Sea Scrolls

Unfortunately the only relevant material preserved among the Dead Sea Scrolls is a section of Ezra (4QEzra, preserving 4.2–6, 9–11; 5.17–6.5). However, the amount of material is very small (3 fragments, approx. 68 words, many incomplete) and its few variants are not of any significance.

VI. Ideology and Exegesis

A notable feature of 1 Esdras is that the Nehemiah material is entirely omitted, although scholars disagree as to whether this is deliberate (and therefore ideological) or whether it results from the Nehemiah material being later. Eskenazi (‘Chronicler’, pp. 45–46; cf. Wright, ‘Remember Nehemiah’), following Kellermann (*Nehemiah*, pp. 131–33), has suggested that Nehemiah is omitted in order to heighten the role of

Zerubbabel, the Davidic figure, which is plausible given that the emphasis on Zerubbabel is seen clearly in the inclusion of the narrative of the three bodyguards (1 Esd. 3.1–5.6)—originally an independent narrative in Hebrew or Aramaic. The purpose of the narrative is apparently twofold: (a) to introduce and magnify Zerubbabel, who was associated with laying the foundation of the temple (Zech. 4.19; 1 Esd. 5.54-55), and (b) to explain why Darius was so favourable to the Jews in granting them permission to return and build the temple (1 Esd. 4.42-46).

1 Esdras also exhibits a tendency to elevate the status of Ezra. For example, Ezra is referred to as ‘high priest’ (ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς, 1 Esd. 9.40, 49), whereas the parallel passage in Nehemiah refer to him simply as ‘the scribe’ (8.1) and ‘the scribe, the priest’ (8.9).

The temple also receives greater emphasis, with the translator preferring the terms ὁ ναός and τὸ ἱερόν for the ‘temple’, in contrast to the LXX where ὁ οἶκος (‘house’) is more common. A range of other distinctive terminology suggests the translator’s preoccupation with cultic matters (see Talshir, *Origin*, pp. 249–55).

VII. Reception History

Josephus made use of 1 Esdras in his *Antiquities* (10.70-83; 11.1-157), including the narrative of the three bodyguards (*Ant.* 11.33-68). Whether Josephus can be taken as a trustworthy witness to the text of 1 Esdras has occasioned some debate (§ V above).

There are no direct citations of 1 Esdras in the New Testament. The work was evidently widely known among the early Church Fathers although citations are relatively infrequent. Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Cyprian, Tertullian, Cyril of Alexandria, Eusebius of Caesarea, Athanasius, Ephrem the Syrian, Theodoret, to name but a few, all quote from or allude to 1 Esdras.

Though not regarded as canonical, the widespread usage of 1 Esdras ensured it a place in an appendix to the Vulgate. Its fate at the reformation was consequently different from other apocryphal books. Luther omitted the work (along with 2 Esdras) from his 1534 translation, and it is not included among those books declared (deutero)canonical at the Council of Trent (Fourth Session, 1546). In the Anglican formulation,

however, it found a place among those books to be read as an ‘example of life and instruction of manners’ though not for establishing doctrine (The Thirty-Nine Articles, Article VI. Final form: 1571 C.E.). 1 Esdras is canonical in the Orthodox Church.

Bibliography

- Attridge, H.W., ‘Historiography’, in M.E. Stone (ed.), *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984), pp. 157–84.
- Becking, B., ‘The Story of the Three Youths and the Composition of 1 Esdras’, in L.S. Fried (ed.), *Was 1 Esdras First? An Investigation into the Priority and Nature of 1 Esdras* (Ancient Israel and Its Literature 7; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), pp. 61–71.
- Bird, M.F., *1 Esdras: Introduction and Commentary on the Greek Text in Codex Vaticanus* (Septuagint Commentary Series; Leiden: Brill, 2012).
- Böhler, D., *Die heilige Stadt in Esdras und Esra–Nehemia* (OBO 158; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997).
- ‘The Two Recensions of the Book of Ezra: Ezra–Neh (MT) and 1 Esdras (LXX)’, in Adrian Schenker (ed.), *The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible* (SBLSCS 52; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003), pp. 35–50.
- ‘Übersetzungstechnik und Textkritik in den Esdrasbüchern: Hendiadyoin, Doppelübersetzungen und Wiederholungsvariationen in 1 Esdr.’, in J. Cook and H.-J. Stipp (eds.), *Text-Critical and Hermeneutical Studies in the Septuagint* (VTSup 157; Leiden: Brill, 2012), pp. 97–125.
- Carr, D.M., *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible: A New Reconstruction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).
- Carrez, M., ‘1. Esdras Septante’, *RHPR* 74 (1994), pp. 13–42.
- Cross, F.M., ‘A Reconstruction of the Judean Restoration’, *JBL* 94 (1975), pp. 4–18.
- De Troyer, K., ‘Zerubbabel and Ezra: A Revived and Revised Solomon and Josiah? A Survey of Current 1 Esdras Research’, *CBR* 1 (2002), pp. 30–60.
- Dillard, R.B., *2 Chronicles* (WBC 15; Waco, TX: Word Books, 1988).
- Eskenazi, T.C., ‘The Chronicler and the Composition of 1 Esdras’, *CBQ* 48 (1986), pp. 39–61.
- In an Age of Prose: A Literary Approach to Ezra–Nehemiah* (SBL Monograph Series 36; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988).
- Fried, L.S., ‘Why the Story of the Three Youths in 1 Esdras?’, in L.S. Fried (ed.), *Was 1 Esdras First? An Investigation into the Priority and Nature of 1 Esdras* (Ancient Israel and Its Literature 7; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), pp. 83–92.
- Fulton, D.N., and G.N. Knoppers, ‘Lower Criticism and Higher Criticism: The Case of 1 Esdras’, in L.S. Fried (ed.), *Was 1 Esdras First? An Investigation into the Priority and Nature of 1 Esdras* (Ancient Israel and Its Literature 7; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), pp. 11–29.

- Gardner, A.E., 'The Purpose and Date of 1 Esdras', *JJS* 37 (1986), pp. 18–27.
- Grabbe, L.L., 'Chicken or Egg? Which Came First, 1 Esdras or Ezra–Nehemiah?', in L.S. Fried (ed.), *Was 1 Esdras First? An Investigation into the Priority and Nature of 1 Esdras* (Ancient Israel and Its Literature 7; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), pp. 31–43.
- Ezra–Nehemiah* (Old Testament Readings; London: Routledge, 1998).
- Hanhart, R., *Text und Textgeschichte des 1. Esrabuches* (MSU 12; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974).
- Hanhart, R. (ed.), *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum*. Vol. VIII.1, *Esdrae liber I* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974).
- Harvey, Jr., P.B., 'Darius' Court and the Guardsmen's Debate: Hellenistic Greek Elements in 1 Esdras', in L.S. Fried (ed.), *Was 1 Esdras First? An Investigation into the Priority and Nature of 1 Esdras* (Ancient Israel and Its Literature 7; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), pp. 179–90.
- Japhet, S., *I & II Chronicles* (OTL; London: SCM, 1993).
- Keil, C.F., *The Books of Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther* (trans. S. Taylor; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1873).
- Kellermann, U., *Nehemiah. Quellen, Überlieferung und Geschichte* (BZAW 102; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1967).
- Klein, R.W., 'Old Readings in I Esdras: The List of Returnees from Babylon (Ezra 2 // Nehemiah 7)', *HTR* 62 (1969), pp. 99–107.
- Kooij, A. van der, 'On the Ending of the Book of 1 Esdras', in C.E. Cox (ed.), *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* (Atlanta: Scholars, 1991), pp. 37–49.
- 'Zur Frage des Anfangs des 1. Esrabuches', *ZAW* 103 (1991), pp. 239–52.
- Marcus, D., *Ezra and Nehemiah* (BHQ 20; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006).
- Moulton, W.J., 'Über die Überlieferung und den textkritischen Werth des dritten Esrabuchs', *ZAW* 19 (1899), pp. 209–58.
- Muraoka, T., *A Greek–Hebrew/Aramaic Index to 1 Esdras* (SBLSCS 16; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1984).
- Myers, J.M., *I and II Esdras* (AB 42; New York: Doubleday, 1974).
- Pakkala, J., 'Why 1 Esdras Is Probably Not an Early Version of the Ezra–Nehemiah Tradition', in L.S. Fried (ed.), *Was 1 Esdras First? An Investigation into the Priority and Nature of 1 Esdras* (Ancient Israel and Its Literature 7; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), pp. 93–107.
- Pfeiffer, R.H., *History of New Testament Times: With an Introduction to the Apocrypha* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1949), pp. 233–57.
- Pohlmann, K.F., *3. Esra-Buch* (JSHRZ 1.5; Gütersloh: Mohn, 1980).
- Studien zum dritten Esra* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970).
- Schenker, A., 'La Relation d'Esdras A' au text massorétique d'Esdras–Néhémie', in G. J. Norton and S. Pisano (eds.), *Tradition of the Text* (OBO 109; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991), pp. 218–48.

The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint

- Talshir, Z., *1 Esdras: A Text Critical Commentary* (SBLSCS 50; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001).
- 1 Esdras: From Origin to Translation* (SBLSCS 47; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1999).
- Talshir, Z., and D. Talshir, ‘The Original Language of the Story of the Three Youths (1 Esdras 3–4) [Hebrew]’, in M. Fishbane and E. Tov (eds.), ‘*Sha’arei Talmon*’: *Studies in the Bible, Qumran, and the Ancient Near East* (Festschrift S. Talmon; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1992), pp. 63*–75*.
- Torrey, C.C., *Ezra Studies* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1910).
- ‘The Nature and Origin of First Esdras’, *AJSL* 23 (1907), pp. 116–41.
- VanderKam, J.C., ‘Literary Questions between Ezra, Nehemiah, and 1 Esdras’, in L.S. Fried (ed.), *Was 1 Esdras First? An Investigation into the Priority and Nature of 1 Esdras* (Ancient Israel and Its Literature 7; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), pp. 131–43.
- Williamson, H.G.M., *1 and 2 Chronicles* (NCBC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982).
- ‘1 Esdras as Rewritten Bible?’, in L.S. Fried (ed.), *Was 1 Esdras First? An Investigation into the Priority and Nature of 1 Esdras* (Ancient Israel and Its Literature 7; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), pp. 237–49.
- Ezra, Nehemiah* (WBC 16; Waco, TX: Word Books, 1985).
- Israel in the Books of Chronicles* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977).
- ‘The Problem with First Esdras’, in J. Barton and D. J. Reimer (eds.), *After the Exile* (Festschrift R. Mason; Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1996), pp. 201–16.
- Wright, J.L., ‘Remember Nehemiah: 1 Esdras and the *Damnatio Memoriae Nehemiae*’, in L.S. Fried (ed.), *Was 1 Esdras First? An Investigation into the Priority and Nature of 1 Esdras* (Ancient Israel and Its Literature 7; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2011), pp. 145–63.

2 Esdras

R. Glenn Wooden

Editions

(a) Standard Greek Editions

Göttingen, vol. VIII.2, *Esdrae liber II* (Hanhart, 1993).

Cambridge, vol. II.4, *Esdras, Ezra–Nehemiah* (Brooke, McLean, and Thackeray, 1935).

Rahlfs-Hanhart, vol. I, pp. 903–50.

Swete, vol. II, pp. 162–212.

(b) Modern Translations

NETS (Wooden, 2007), pp. 405–23.

LXX.D (Kabiersch, 2009), pp. 567–90.

Bd'A 11.2 (Janz, 2010).

La Biblia Griega, vol. II (Fernández Marcos *et al.*, 2011), pp. 591–642.

I. General Characteristics

2 Esdras (Ἔσδρας β΄) is the translation of the Hebrew-Aramaic books of Ezra and Nehemiah, covering the return from exile, reconstruction of the temple, and rebuilding of the walls of Jerusalem. Unlike 1 Esdras (*s.v.*), 2 Esdras includes all the material in both canonical books and with little alteration. There was little, if any, use of 1 Esdras for the production of the translation of 2 Esdras.

This book is not to be confused with the Latin 2 Esdras, a composite work found translated in some English versions of the Apocrypha, and comprising what are also known as 4, 5 and 6 Ezra. Nor should it be confused with the Vulgate 2 Esdras, which is the translation of the book of Nehemiah.

2 Esdras is a rather strict, isomorphic representation of the Hebrew-Aramaic Ezra–Nehemiah: the translation follows the MT in most places, word-for-word, in the Hebrew-Aramaic word order. It has similarities to the *kaige* recension, but it is peripherally related and not strictly *kaige*; it was once considered Theodotion and has been associated with Theodotion Daniel. It contains many transcriptions rather than translations, almost invariably uses $\kappa\alpha\iota$ for ו while employing very few other conjunctions, and probably dates to the middle to end of the second century C.E.

Little research has been undertaken on many aspects of this translation, and therefore some issues remain provisional. The most significant work on the book is the commentary with extensive introduction, by Timothy Janz ('Le deuxième livre'), now complemented by his *Bible d'Alexandrie* commentary (*Bd'A* 11.2).

II. Time and Place of Composition

2 Esdras seems to be among the latest of the translations of the Jewish Scriptures, originating in the latter half of the second century C.E. Philo has no need to use 2 Esdras and so is of no help in determining the existence of the book at that time. For the history of the return and early post-exilic period in *Antiquities* 11 (and possibly in *Apion* 1.132; 1.145), Josephus used 1 Esdras, beginning with ch. 2. In addition to including the story of the three youths from 1 Esdras (*Ant.* 11.120-158), his version of the return from exile makes use of the Ezra story based on 1 Esdras and a version of the Nehemiah narrative that is not now extant (see Janz, *Bd'A* 11.2, pp. 165–66). The earliest and clearest use of 2 Esdras is in the Isaiah commentary of Eusebius (d. 339 C.E.), which must serve as the latest possible date for the translation (*Bd'A* 11.2, pp. 172, 185).

Blau argued that it was the latest of the translations, based upon its place in a trajectory of the transliterations of ט and צ into Greek among Jewish translators and authors. In 2 Esdras ט and צ are transliterated with no consonant, rather than χ and γ , respectively, which are what one finds in Josephus and Aquila (Blau, *Polyphony*, p. 71). Based upon these facts and a marshalling of further transcription evidence, Steiner dated

the translation to the middle to end of the second century C.E. ('Dating', pp. 229–67). This would accord with the use of the book by Eusebius, giving the translation time to circulate and be accepted.

There is nothing specific in the text that helps to determine the location of the translation. Janz (*Bd'A* 11.2, pp. 163–64) suggests that it is more likely to come from Palestine, but admits that the question remains open owing to the conflicting evidence of scholarship (whether the *kaige* group is Palestinian-based or not) and the text (the facility with Greek is less than one would expect of an Alexandrian, but the knowledge of Jerusalem and the temple cultus is less than one would expect of a Palestinian).

III. Language

The Greek of this book is typified by its slavish adherence to the structure of the Hebrew-Aramaic text, making it 'translationese' throughout. Thus, the word-order of the Greek follows that of the Hebrew-Aramaic with little variation (Wooden, 'Interlinearity', pp. 129–31). This results in such features as redundant adverbs and pronouns, where the Greek has a relative pronoun or adverb to translate **אשר** or **די**, but also redundantly translates a subsequent adverb or pronoun in the Hebrew/Aramaic. For example, at 1.4 the text has: 'And every one left shall go up from all the places where (**אשר** – οὗ) he resides there (**םש** – ἐκεῖ)' (see also 1.4; 6.12; 11.9; 14.14); and at 9.11, 'The land that (**אשר** – εἰς ἣν) you are entering to possess it (**לרשתה** – ἀληρονομηῆσαι αὐτήν)'; and 'who they have filled it' (**מלאוה אשר** – ὧν ἔπλησαν αὐτήν) (see also 11.9; 12.8, 12, 17; 19.12, 19).

The most extreme example of the influence of the Semitic parent text on the translation is those places where the Greek is rendered based upon the mere appearance of the Hebrew, without respect for the grammar of either Hebrew or Greek: at 9.1; 10.18; 13.24–25, 26, 31; 14.13; 21.4–7, 25–30 there are lists of nouns that, in the Hebrew, are juxtaposed to a first element (e.g., a preposition) and the grammar of the first element is assumed for the following items. For example at Ezra 9.1 we find **לכנעני החתי הפרזי היבוסי העמני המאבי המצרי והאמרי** ('from the Canaanites, the Hittites, the Perizzites, the Jebusites, the Ammonites, the

Moabites, the Egyptians, and the Amorites' NRSV). In 2 Esdras, however, we find τῶ Χανανί, ὁ Ἑθθί, ὁ Φερεζί, ὁ Ἰεβουσί, ὁ Ἀμμωνί, ὁ Μωάβ, ὁ Μωσρί καὶ ὁ Ἀμορί ('to the Chanani—the Heththi, the Pherezi, the Iebousi, the Ammoni, the Moab, the Mosri and the Amori—' NETS). The translator seems to have focused on the rather narrow context of the individual word, and to have ignored the grammar of the receptor language, thus translating the first word as a dative to match the preposition in the Hebrew, but the subsequent items as nominatives, probably because the items in the Hebrew lacked the preposition (Wooden, 'Interlinearity', pp. 133–43).

IV. Translation and Composition

Although there are connections with the *kaige* translations, 2 Esdras is only marginally related, because the *kaige* characteristics do not occur in a systematic or consistent way. Of the four criteria established by Barthélemy ('Prise', pp. 267–69), only three have the necessary Hebrew/Aramaic counterpart in MT Ezra–Nehemiah: (a) The signature criterion, the translation of םג/גג by καὶ γε, occurs only once (1.1) for the eighteen occurrences of גג and םג in the MT Ezra–Nehemiah. (b) Although מן ('man') occurs fifty-eight times in Ezra–Nehemiah, it is translated only forty-nine times, and not exclusively by ἀνὴρ. (c) Finally, although ׀ן occurs fifteen times in the MT, the translation in 2 Esdras is contextualised all but once (12.12; the occurrence at 14.23 [17] has no equivalent in the Greek; see Barthélemy, 'Prise', pp. 267–69; Janz, 'Second Book', pp. 154–70; *Bd'A* 11.2, pp. 151–61; and Wooden, 'Interlinearity', pp. 122–24). Janz has compared the work extensively with a plethora of characteristics associated with the *kaige* recension, and the results are similarly mixed. He concludes that it is a marginal member of the *kaige* group.

The translation is noted for its strict isomorphic (morpheme-for-morpheme) translation of the Hebrew-Aramaic *Vorlage*. It varies so little from the order of the MT that there are only about forty inversions of words (cf. Tov and Polak, 'Revised CATSS'—based upon Rahlfs's text, not Hanhart's; cf. Wooden, 'Interlinearity', pp. 129–31, items 20, 21, 53).

The level of stilted translation is also demonstrated by the almost invariable translation of ו by καί. There are 166 occurrences of ו and 154 occurrences of καί, and there are only eleven occurrences for which there is no explanation for why there is no match in the Greek or Hebrew/Aramaic. Additionally, although we would expect the Hebrew conjunction to be rendered by other prepositions, δέ occurs only four times in all of 2 Esdras, and only at 7.9 does it render a ו, the other three being introduced where there is no Hebrew/Aramaic conjunction (2 Esd. 2.64; 5.12; 7.9; 19.18). In fact, only one ו is accounted for by a conjunction other than καί—ἐάν τε at 7.26 (cf. Wooden, ‘Interlinearity’, pp. 131–33).

One of the associations with Theodotion has been the use of transcriptions rather than translations of some terms (Torrey, ‘Apparatus’, pp. 64–71; cf. Janz, ‘Second Book’, p. 164 n. 36). Leaving aside the more than 500 proper nouns, there are 38 distinct transcriptions of common nouns as proper nouns (e.g., Βηθαγγαβαρίμ rather than ‘the house of the warriors’, 13.16), technical terms (e.g., Μαναά, 23.5, 9; πάσχα, 6.19, 20, 21), and negative interpretations (e.g., Ἀβδησελμά rather than ‘servants of Solomon’, 2.55, 58; see Wooden, ‘Interlinearity’, pp. 125–29; *Bd’A* 11.2, pp. 100–106).¹ The transcriptions are not consistent throughout the book and so we find both ναθιναῖοι (2.43; 21.3) and ναθινίμ (2.58, 70, etc.) for נַתְיִימִים, and ἀβιρά (11.1) and τῆς βιρά for הַבִּירָה. The same is true for proper nouns, such as Ἀδδίν (2.15), Ἀδίν (8.6) and Ἡδίν (17.20) for יְדִיעַ.

Assuming a translation from the second century C.E., this book contains seven probable neologisms: ἐκουσιασμός ‘free-will offering’, ἐπιγεμίζω ‘lay as a burden’, ἐπιεικέυομαι ‘to be fitting’, ἡρεμάζω ‘to be still, silent’, μαδαρόω ‘make bald’, μάκρυμμα ‘a thing put far away’, and ῥοποπώλης ‘dealer in petty wares’. Although LEH lists 16 words as probable or possible neologisms (ἀναφράσσομαι, δεκατόω, διασφαγή, διαταγή, ἐκουσιασμός, ἐπιγεμίζω, ἐπιεικέυομαι, ἐπιχώρησις, ζωποίησις, ἡρεμάζω, θεμελίωσις, κραυγάζω, μαδαρόω, μάκρυμμα, ῥοποπώλης, συνοδία), a date in second century C.E., rather than a pre-Christian date, reduces the probable candidates when the lexemes are searched in *TLG*.

1. We now use ‘transcription’ to designate the transference of the sounds (consonants and vowels) from Hebrew/Aramaic into Greek letters, and ‘transliteration’ for the transference of only the Aramaic consonants.

V. Key Text-Critical Issues

The *Vorlage* of the translation matches the MT of Ezra and Nehemiah for the most part. There is a variety of small minuses of one to three words, but there are also more significant differences, such as at 4.14 where ‘Now because we share the salt of the palace’ is lacking in the Greek (see further on ch. 4 below), and at 18.3 where ‘facing the square before the Water Gate from early morning’ becomes ‘from the hour the sun dawned until half the day’, owing both to a minus in the Greek and to the expansion of מן האור to ἀπὸ τῆς ὥρας τοῦ διαφωτίζει τὸν ἥλιον (διαφωτίζει ‘to dawn’ being a *hapax legomenon* in the LXX canon). In addition to these, in the Nehemiah material there are significant minuses in the Greek with respect to the Hebrew, at Neh. 3.37-38 (14.6 LXX);² 9(19).5, 36-37; 11(21).12-35; and 12(22).2-9, 25, 29. Although it is possible that these may be due merely to textual corruption, it is also possible that they are evidence of a pre-MT version of the book (Knoppers, ‘Sources’, pp. 141–68; Fulton, ‘Where’).

Versification differs among editions of Greek 2 Esdras, English translations of the MT, and the MT (*BHS*) itself:

Hanhart (2 Esd.) and English versions (Neh.)	MT (Neh.) and Rahlfs-Hanhart (2 Esd.)
14.1-4 (4.1-4a)	3(13).33-36a
14.5-6 (4.4b-5a)	3.36b-37a (13.36b-37)
— (4.5b-6)	3.37b-38 (—)
14(4).7-23	4(14).1-17
17(7).67-68	
18(8).1a	7(17).73b
19(9).38	10(20).1
20(10).1-39	10(20).2-40

VI. Ideology and Exegesis

The translation’s very close representation of the MT means that little of the translator’s views are revealed. However, in chs. 4–5 the storyline changes when, in addition to other changes, the נשתון ‘letters’ that go back and forth between the Judaeans and Persians are turned into a

2. In English versions this is 4.5b-6 NRSV.

loathed φορολόγος ‘tribute collector’ of the king (5.5). He was worried about losing some of the φόρος for which he was responsible, should Jerusalem and its political and religious infrastructure be restored, and he thus writes (4.7), delivers (4.18), reads (4.23), and receives (5.5) messages that focus on ensuring the consistent collection of φόρος ‘tribute’. Given the otherwise strict isomorphic rendering of the MT, these changes, which are all focused on the tribute collector, suggest that something from the life or circumstances of the translator led to an altering of the text (Wooden, ‘The φορολόγος’, pp. 248–57).

VII. Reception History

The earliest use of 2 Esdras is by the Church Fathers when they refer to the return of the Jews from exile (although Janz has now proposed that some authors may have used a now lost source that combined details from both 1 Esdras and 2 Esdras, as for example is clear in Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 1.123-124 [*Bd’A* 11.2, pp. 174–77]). The earliest clear reference to details from 2 Esdras is by Eusebius of Caesarea (d. 339 C.E.) in his commentary on Isaiah to 14.2 (*Comm. Isa.* 1.68) where he refers to the exile under the Babylonians; and there is a possible allusion to 2 Esd. 1.8 by Theophilus of Antioch (d. ca. 184 C.E.; *Autol.* 3.25; *Bd’A* 11.2, pp. 172, 185). Origen (d. 254 C.E.) refers to Nehemiah’s designation of himself as a ‘eunuch of the king’ (at 2 Esd. 11.11) both in his exposition of Mt. 19.12 (*Comm. Matt.* 15.5) and in his *Letter to Africanus* 564. The translation was also of great interest to Judaism, as the Jewish Lucianic recension and translation by Aquila suggest (*Bd’A* 11.2, p. 166).

Bibliography

- Allgeier, A., ‘Beobachtungen am Septuagintatext der Bücher Esdras und Nehemias’, *Bib* 22 (1941), pp. 227–51.
- Barthélemy, D., ‘Prise de position sur les autres communications du colloque de Los Angeles’, in D. Barthélemy (ed.), *Études d’histoire du texte de l’Ancien Testament* (OBO 21; Fribourg: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978), pp. 267–69.
- Blau, J., *On Polyphony in Biblical Hebrew* (Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities 6/2; Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1982).

The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint

- Fulton, D.N., 'Where Did the Judeans, Benjaminites, and Levites Settle? Revisiting the text of MT and LXX Nehemiah 11:25-36', in I. Kalimi (ed.), *New Perspectives on Ezra–Nehemiah: History and Historiography, Text, Literature and Interpretation* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2012), pp. 197–222.
- Gwynn, R.M., 'Notes on the Authorship of Some Books of the Greek Old Testament', *Hermathena* 20 (1930), pp. 52–61.
- Hanhart, R. (ed.), *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum*. Vol. VIII.2, *Esdrae liber II* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993).
- Text und Textgeschichte des 2. Esrabuches* (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse 253; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003).
- Howorth, H.H., 'Some Unconventional Views on the Text of the Bible: IV. The LXX Text of the Book of Nehemiah', *PSBA* 24 (1902), pp. 332–40.
- 'Some Unconventional Views on the Text of the Bible: IV. The LXX Text of the Book of Nehemiah (Continued)', *PSBA* 25 (1903), pp. 15–22, 90–98.
- Jahn, G., *Die Bücher Esra (A und B) und Nehemja, text-kritisch und historisch-kritisch untersucht mit Erklärung der einschlägigen Prophetenstellen und einem Anhang über hebräische Eigennamen* (Leiden: Brill, 1909).
- Janz, T., 'Le Deuxième Livre d'Esdras: Traduction et Réception' (Ph.D. dissertation, Université Paris IV, 1998).
- 'The Second Book of Ezra and the "Καί γε Group"', in B.A. Taylor (ed.), *IX Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Cambridge, 1995* (SBLSCS 45; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), pp. 154–70.
- Janz, T. (ed.), *La Bible d'Alexandrie*. Vol. XII.2, *Deuxième livre d'Esdras* (Paris: Cerf, 2010).
- Klostermann, A., 'Esra und Nehemia', in J.J. Herzog (ed.), *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, vol. V (22 vols.; Hamburg: R. Besser, 1854–68), pp. 500–523.
- Knoppers, G.N., 'Sources, Revisions, and Editions: The Lists of Jerusalem's Residents in MT and LXX Nehemiah 11 and 1 Chronicles 9', *Textus* 20 (2000), pp. 141–68.
- Steiner, R.C., 'On the Dating of Hebrew Sound Changes (*Ḥ > Ḥ and Ġ > Ġ) and Greek Translations (2 Esdras and Judith)', *JBL* 124 (2005), pp. 229–67.
- Torrey, C.C., 'The Apparatus for the Textual Criticism of Chronicles–Ezra–Nehemiah', in R.F. Harper, F. Brown and G.F. Moore (eds.), *Old Testament and Semitic Studies* (Festschrift W.R. Harper; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1908), pp. 64–71 [republished as *Ezra Studies* (LBS; New York: KTAV, 1970), pp. 70–77].
- Tov, E., and F. Polak, 'The Revised CATSS Hebrew/Greek Parallel Text', Electronic text hypertexted and prepared by OakTree Software, Inc. Version 1.2, 2009.
- Wooden, R.G., 'Interlinearity in 2 Esdras: A Test Case', in W. Kraus and R.G. Wooden (eds.), *Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Jewish Greek Scriptures* (SBLSCS 53; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), pp. 119–44.
- 'The φορολόγος of 2 Esdras 4', in W. Kraus and M. Karrer (eds.), *Die Septuaginta: Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten* (WUNT 219; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), pp. 248–57.

Esther and Additions to Esther

Cameron Boyd-Taylor

Editions

(a) Standard Greek Editions

Göttingen, vol. VIII.3, *Esther* (Hanhart, 1983; 2nd ed.).

Cambridge, vol. III.1, *Esther, Judith, Tobit* (Brooke, McLean, and Thackeray, 1940).

Rahlfs-Hanhart, vol. I, pp. 951–72.

Swete, vol. II, pp. 755–80.

(b) Other Greek Editions

Libri Apocryphi Veteri Testamenti graece (Fritzsche, 1871).

Librorum Veteris Testamenti Canoniorum Pars Prior Graece (de Lagarde, 1883).

(c) Modern Translations

NETS (Jobes, 2007), pp. 424–40.

LXX.D (De Troyer and Wacker, 2009), pp. 593–617.

Bd'A 12 (Cavalier, 2012).

La Biblia Griega, vol. II (Fernández Marcos *et al.*, 2011), pp. 643–80.

I. General Characteristics

The reception history of the book of Esther has aptly been described as a catalogue of attempts to redeem a strange and difficult text (Carruthers, *Esther*, p. 9). Within that catalogue the Septuagint version has pride of place, representing as it does the earliest such attempt. If it too seems strange and difficult, this is attributable in large part to the complexity of its relationship to the Hebrew. It is often observed that LXX contains

hardly a single verse without a minus of a word, clause or phrase in comparison to the Masoretic text. To what extent these differences are attributable to the Semitic *Vorlage* of LXX, or to the translation and textual history of the Greek version, is not altogether certain. Where LXX does parallel MT it tends to follow the Hebrew text fairly closely. At the same time, it is decidedly expansive. There are numerous short pluses located in the midst of verses, including brief explanatory glosses analogous to what one finds in the Targums (Paton, *Commentary*, p. 33). These differences notwithstanding, critical study of the Greek text generally proceeds on the assumption that LXX translates a Hebrew source substantially like the consonantal text of MT. Torrey's ('Older', p. 5) argument for an Aramaic source has not found favour.

In addition to the short pluses, there are six substantial passages in the Greek text not found in MT. The so-called Additions to Esther (some 107 verses) represent the most striking feature of the translation, adding more than 50% to the number of words in the Greek text (Dorothy, *Books*, p. 15). While these passages represent formally coherent units of discourse, they are perhaps best described as narrative expansions (Tov, 'Three', p. 379). Their secondary character with respect to MT has been demonstrated on both internal and external grounds (Moore, *Daniel*, pp. 153–54). Hence, for methodological purposes, a notional distinction between the Additions, on the one hand, and the text of LXX excluding the Additions, on the other, is justifiable. The practice of treating the former independently of their context dates back to Jerome, who, in preparing the Vulgate, extracted them from the narrative and placed them at its end.

Addition A occurs at the beginning of the Greek version before MT 1.1. It is comprised of two distinct sections: the first (A 1-11) reports Mordecai's dream, an allegory of the ensuing narrative; the second (A 12-17) is a variation on Mordecai's discovery of the plot against the king at MT 2.21-23. Addition B occurs between MT 3.13 and 3.14, and records the king's decree ordering the destruction of his Jewish subjects. Addition C follows MT 4.17 (between chs. 4 and 5). The first part (C 1-10) contains a prayer of Mordecai, the second (C 14-30) a prayer of Esther. Addition D replaces MT 5.1-2, expanding the two Hebrew verses to sixteen. It narrates Esther's appeal to the king. Addition E, which follows MT 8.12, records a royal decree permitting the Jews to defend

themselves. Addition F follows MT 10.3. It interprets the figures of Mordecai's dream (i.e. Addition A) in light of the intervening narrative. F 11 is a colophon.

Literary analysis of the Additions raises the distinct possibility that they were derived from disparate sources, perhaps in different languages. The Greek text may thus have undergone several stages of development, its characteristic themes resulting from the contribution of numerous individuals over a period of time (Fox, *Character*, p. 266). Yet despite its heterogeneous sources LXX reads as a relatively coherent work with distinctive literary and ideological features. The Additions are in many respects consistent with the *Tendenz* of the original Greek translation, and were likely harmonised to some degree (Moore, *Daniel*, p. 168).

II. Time and Place of Composition

A date in the late Persian or early Hellenistic period is probable for the original Hebrew text of Esther, though it is unlikely that the Greek translation was undertaken this early. Ideological considerations favour the late second or early first century B.C.E. The *terminus ad quem* is 93–94 C.E., at which time the Greek version was paraphrased by Josephus (*Ant.* 11.184–296). Josephus makes no reference to Additions A and F, but whether they were absent in his source is unknown. If Greek Esther was redacted over a series of stages, various forms of the text could have been in circulation simultaneously.

The most important piece of evidence for the provenance of LXX is the colophon (F 11). It provides a date for the translation (purportedly brought to Egypt during the reign of Ptolemy and Cleopatra), names the translator (Lysimachus son of Ptolemy), and locates him geographically (Jerusalem). Bickerman ('Colophon', p. 347) has demonstrated to the satisfaction of most that the colophon refers to the fourth year of the reign of Ptolemy XII Auletos and Cleopatra V (his sister and wife), and was thus written sometime between 12 September 78 B.C.E and 11 September 77 B.C.E. On the assumption that LXX was produced in Jerusalem during the reign of Alexander Jannaeus (103–76 B.C.E.), Bickerman ('Colophon', pp. 361–62) emphasises the existing tensions between the Hasmonean regime and the Greek cities of the Levant. An anti-Jewish backlash had occurred in Alexandria and Antioch, where in

88–87 B.C.E. the earliest recorded riots against Jews occurred. It is conceivable that Greek Esther reflects this fraught situation.

Jacob ('Das Buch', pp. 274–90) presents internal evidence that the translator himself was an Egyptian Jew. The king's courtiers are referred to as φίλοι (1.3, 13; 2.18; 3.1; 6.9), φίλος being a title at the Ptolemaic court for members of the king's entourage. Another item of significance is the use of κωμάρχας at 2.3 in reference to local officials. In Ptolemaic Egypt the κωμάρχης was in charge of the civil administration of a village (κώμη). Other terms might be cited. Taken together they are relatively persuasive, yet not one is decisive on the issue of provenance (Bickerman, 'Notes', p. 115). Collins (*Between Athens*, p. 111) concludes that there is no good reason to doubt the colophon.

It is widely held that some of the Additions to the Greek text were introduced subsequent to its translation. Moore (*Daniel*, p. 389) notes various ambiguities in Mordecai's dream and concludes that Addition A circulated independently before it was adapted as a framing device. Jobes (*Alpha-Text*, p. 184) demurs, pointing to the brevity of the text as a mark of literary dependence. The imagery is purely associative, echoing images from earlier biblical texts. According to Jobes (*Alpha-Text*, pp. 186–93), it alludes specifically to the Septuagint version of Jeremiah 28. If, on the evidence of Ben Sira, the Greek translation of Jeremiah is dated sometime before 116 B.C.E., this would provide a *terminus post quem* for Additions A and F.

Addition A is reminiscent of apocalyptic literature, and accords well with a late second century B.C.E. Palestinian context (Collins, *Between Athens*, p. 94). The same milieu has also been suggested for the prayers of Mordecai and Esther (Addition C). This would account for their apologetic tone and anti-Gentile spirit. They were doubtlessly composed with a view to their current role in the book of Esther (Moore, *Daniel*, p. 391). Jobes (*Alpha-Text*, p. 181) argues from internal evidence that the Greek version of the prayers logically precede the second royal decree (Addition E). Hence either Addition C was present in Greek Esther prior to the composition of E, or else both Additions were introduced at the same time.

The distinctive subject matter and style of Additions B and E suggest to Moore (*Daniel*, p. 166) a sophisticated Jewish centre such as Alexandria. Given the striking resemblance of Addition B to a decree of Ptolemy Philopator recorded in 3 Maccabees, he places its composition in the first century B.C.E. (*Daniel*, p. 195). A direct link between the two books has been proposed on structural-thematic grounds. Yet, as Hacham ('3 Maccabees', p. 771) has argued, the literary evidence remains inconclusive. What can be established are affinities between the royal decrees (i.e., Addition B and 3 *Macc.* 3.12-29; Addition E and 3 *Macc.* 7.1-9). Hacham identifies a concentration of significant linguistic agreements, corroborating the findings of Moore's (*Daniel*, pp. 384–85) stylistic analysis. He concludes that the decrees in Esther were composed subsequent to 3 Maccabees and were influenced by it ('3 Maccabees', p. 779).

De Troyer's analysis (*End*, p. 398) analysis of Addition E raises the interesting possibility that LXX never lacked it. On the hypothesis that the translator of LXX was the author of the edict, she argues that he interpreted his Hebrew source in light of the events of 164 B.C.E. The letters of Antiochus IV Epiphanes and his successor Antiochus V Eupator preserved in 2 Maccabees 11 were primary sources of inspiration.

III. Language

The prose style of the LXX may be described as relatively literary—the translator aimed to produce a text acceptable to Greek readers. An excellent example is the king's remark to Haman at 3.11, τὸ μὲν ἀργύριον ἔχε τῷ δὲ ἔθνει χρῶ ὡς βούλει 'Keep the silver, but treat the nation as you wish', a pithy, formally balanced construction employing idiomatic phrasing. The lexical stock of Greek Esther betrays a confident and sophisticated hand. Thus βασιλικόν (*sic* πρόσταγμα) occurs in the sense of 'royal decree' at 1.19. The rare form ἐπρωτοβάθρει (πρωτοβαθρέω), perhaps a neologism, is used at 3.1 in the sense 'to assume the first seat among others'. Other examples could be cited.

Despite its literary character, LXX is by no means free of linguistic interference. Examples include the otiose repetition of κατὰ χώραν καὶ χώραν 'country by country' (מדינה מדינה) at 8.9, and the occurrence

of the cognate participle in *πεσὼν πεσῆ* ‘you will fall when you fall’ (נפול תפול) at 6.13. Greek lexemes are not always used conventionally: for example at 8.3 *προστίθημι* ‘put; add to, increase’ is made to carry the sense ‘to do again’ (as it often does in Hebrew-Greek translation). There are numerous unidiomatic collocations.

Any assessment of the language of the Additions must address the question of whether or not they are original Greek compositions. From a comparative analysis of selected syntactical features, Martin (‘Syntax’, p. 65) concluded that A, C and D are translations of a Semitic original. If so, they might have been part of the *Vorlage* of Greek Esther, as Emanuel Tov (‘LXX Translation’, pp. 517–19) has recently argued. The original language of Addition F remains somewhat uncertain on Martin’s analysis: it could either be original Greek or else a very free translation of a Semitic *Vorlage*. Additions B and E were composed in Greek.

The syntactical analysis of Jobes (*Alpha-Text*, pp. 29–44) is more guarded in its conclusions. While Addition E is unquestionably a Greek composition, the origins of Additions B, D, and F must remain undetermined. Two findings, however, are relatively robust: Addition C tends towards translation Greek; Addition A tends towards composition Greek. The second result is unexpected, as it generally assumed that Mordecai’s dream is Semitic in origin.

The Greek of the two royal edicts (Additions B and E) is of particular interest. In contrast to the rest of LXX, these texts abound in grammatical constructions characteristic of literary Greek, such as participial and infinitival constructions, genitive absolutes and arthrous nouns separated from their articles by prepositional phrases (Moore, ‘Origin’, p. 384). The overall effect is florid: sentences are awkwardly constructed, repetitious and often obscure. Torrey (‘Older’, p. 27) notes that language of the edicts is typical of a style of Greek written in Egypt in the second century B.C.E.

IV. Translation and Composition

While it is probable that the translator’s Hebrew *Vorlage* was substantially like the consonantal text of MT, this cannot be assumed in every instance. Tov (‘LXX Translation’, pp. 519–20) has made a plausible case

for regarding the parent of LXX as a rewritten version of MT. This caveat notwithstanding, the differences between the Greek and Hebrew texts are for the most part attributable to the translator (see the textual data presented by Kahana, *Esther*).

When the six Additions are excluded, LXX agrees with MT formally in about 62% of its translation units (NETS, p. 424). Yet the translator was not strictly bound to the word order of the Hebrew; nor with giving consistent one-to-one renderings (Moore, *Daniel*, p. 162). Tov ('LXX Translation', pp. 513–14) warns that some paraphrases may be due to a misunderstanding of the Hebrew. Nevertheless there is ample evidence for stylistic and rhetorical concerns.

With respect to the lexicon, there are numerous one-to-many renderings. Thus while Hebrew דבר is rendered ῥήμα at 1.17, it is replaced by the neuter plural participle λεχθέντα in the next verse; at 4.9 it is rendered λόγος. The translation of a Hebrew word is often determined by its immediate context. Hebrew בית provides a convenient example: whereas בביתו is rendered ἐν ταῖς οἰκίαις αὐτῶν at 1.22, the phrase ביתו is replaced by τὰ ἴδια at 5.10, בית המן by ὅσα ὑπήρχεν Αμαν at 8.1 and על בית המן by ἐπὶ πάντων τῶν Αμαν at 8.2. Idiomatic expressions in the Hebrew are frequently recast in Greek. The phrase מלאו לבו, literally 'he filled his heart', meaning 'he presumed', is replaced by ἐτόλμησεν, 'he dared' at 7.5.

Where a formal rendering of Hebrew syntactical features would contravene Greek convention, the translator manipulates the expression accordingly. This often involves constructions with the relative particle; thus at 4.7 אשר קרהו כל is replaced by τὸ γεγονός 'what happened', and at 4.11 אשר לא יקרא is rendered ἄκλητος 'uncalled'. The use of repetition in the source language to convey the distributive sense is handled in a variety of ways; for example, מדינה ומדינה, 'every province', is rendered κατὰ χώραν at 1.22 and 3.14. The Hebrew temporal clause ב + infinitive is rendered by the conjunction ὅτε with a finite verb at 2.8. The high degree of parataxis, so characteristic of Hebrew prose narrative, is relieved by introducing participial constructions (e.g., 3.10).

The translator values an economy of expression. As Jacob ('Das Buch', p. 267) has shown, elements in the Hebrew which are redundant (from the perspective of the target language) are often expressed by a single element. This strategy is especially notable in stereotyped speech,

as at 8.9 where ככתבם וכלשונם is replaced by κατὰ τὴν ἑαυτῶν λέξιν ‘each according to its own language’ (cf. 1.22; 3.12). This phenomenon is also observed where the source language uses more than one verb to describe a unitary action, as at 3.13 where the sequence להשמיד להרהר and ולאבד is rendered ἀφανίσαι.

Well-formed discourse is characterised by both cohesion and coherence. A concern for cohesion is seen at 3.11 where the complementary particles μέν and δέ are introduced to nuance the parataxis of the source. The translator is also interested in drawing out thematic relations. An example is his handling of 1.5-6. At 1.5 the Hebrew narrative records that the king gave a feast in the palace court. This is juxtaposed with a description of the décor at 1.6, with the connection between the two left implicit. The translator introduces κεκοσμημένην at the beginning of 1.6 to enhance the coherence of the two verses.

The rhetorical technique of elaboration is evident throughout. Where the Greek text is expansive, it is often to the end of elucidation. Thus at 8.1 Greek ἐνοικεῖωται αὐτῆν spells out the meaning of the elliptical מה הוא לה. At 8.17 περιετέμοντο και ἰουδαίζον renders מתיהדים, specifying what it means to become a Jew.

Shifts away from the form of the parent often serve a literary strategy. Dorothy (*Books*, p. 361) has suggested that LXX has a markedly reportorial style. While many of the added details are not essential to the overall structure of the book, they nevertheless serve the aim of narrative exposition. Examples include Mordecai’s cry upon learning of the edict against the Jews, Αἴρεται ἔθνος μηδὲν ἡδικοχός ‘An innocent nation is being destroyed’ (4.1), and his ensuing exchange with Esther, particularly his exhortation, μνησθεῖσα ἡμερῶν ταπεινώσεώς σου ὡς ἐτράφησ ἐν χειρὶ μου ‘Remember your humble days when you were brought up by my hand’ (4.8).

V. Text-Critical Issues

a. LXX and AT

Greek Esther comes down to us in two recensions: the Septuagint and the so-called *L* text (or AT), which was once thought to be Lucianic. The text of LXX is witnessed by five uncials, including Chester Beatty Papyrus 967, and many cursives. AT is extant in four miniscule texts: 19

Rome, Chigi R. vi. 38 (now in the Vatican); 108 Rome, Vat. Gr. 330; 93 London, British Museum, Royal 1 D. ii; and 319 Athos, Vatopethi 513.

The relationship between LXX and AT is far from obvious. Textual problems are inextricably bound up with literary issues (Frolov, 'Two Eunuchs', p. 324). One solution is to argue from putative agreements that the two Greek texts are genetically related. Such is the approach of Tov ('Lucianic'), for whom AT is a Hebraising revision of LXX in the direction of a different *Vorlage*. De Troyer (*End*), on the other hand, following Hanhart (Göttingen), concludes that AT is an inner-Greek reworking of LXX. For De Troyer ('Esther', p. 49) the line of development from MT to LXX, and thence from LXX to AT, is an excellent example of how stories were reshaped in Judaism. While the focus of her work has been the ending of AT (7.14-41) (see De Troyer, *End*; and *Rewriting*, pp. 59–90), her analysis of a doublet in LXX and its parallels (the conspiracy of the two eunuchs: A 12-17; 2.21-23; MT 2.21-23; AT A 11b-18) confirms her picture of textual dependence (De Troyer, 'Esther'). On the other hand, Frolov's ('Two Eunuchs', p. 323) redaction-critical study of the very same pericope establishes the independence of AT and LXX. He argues that the source of AT was a heavily reworked version of MT.

The current consensus denies that one version of Greek Esther is a straightforward recension of the other (NETS, p. 425). Jobs (*Alpha-Text*, p. 193) observes that AT and LXX virtually never agree over against MT outside of the Additions. But while most scholars agree that AT is an independent translation of a Hebrew source, the textual relationship of this *Vorlage* to the extant MT remains a vexed question. The work of Moore ('Greek') and Clines (*Esther Scroll*) suggests that it was different from MT. Arguing from putative agreements between AT and MT over against LXX, Fox (*Redaction*, pp. 17–34) has proposed that AT draws upon an earlier stratum in the Hebrew tradition (proto-AT). On his analysis AT translates a Hebrew original shorter and earlier than MT, and different from it in several important respects. Consistent with this hypothesis are the results of Kossman's (*Esthernovelle*) extensive study. A persuasive case can, however, be made for the priority of the extant Hebrew text. Jobs (*Alpha-Text*, pp. 29–47) suggests that LXX and AT were two independently made translations, but that the *Vorlage* of each was similar to the extant MT.

b. Josephus and the Old Latin

That a Greek version served as a primary source for Josephus is almost certain. Nevertheless the question of its textual form is complex (see Feldman, 'Hellenizations', p. 143). It is possible that he drew upon a text distinct from both AT and LXX as his telling of the story lacks many of the small pluses of LXX, and, while some of his omissions are shared with AT, others agree with the Old Latin. There are numerous additions, both short and long, which are unique to him. Bickerman ('Notes', p. 104) concludes that Josephus was following a recension of the Greek text now lost to us that was in use among the Jews in Rome. Yet Feldman ('Hellenizations', p. 144) cautions that Josephus was very free with his sources, which he typically remoulded into a specific pattern. Access to a Targumic paraphrase or midrashic tradition cannot be discounted.

The Old Latin (OL) version of Esther is an important witness to the Greek text before the recension of Origen. While adhering for the most part to a text similar to that of LXX, OL also shares readings peculiar to AT. Like Josephus, it has minuses and pluses unique to it. Yet there are instances in which OL agrees with MT over against the extant Greek versions. These may represent the survival of early Greek readings in the *Vorlage*; alternatively they may point to a distinct Greek recension. OL thus raises a number of interesting problems for the textual history of the Greek text. According to Haelewyck ('Relevance', p. 458), if they are to be solved at all, it will be through literary criticism rather than textual criticism. On his analysis, the source underlying the text of OL represents the earliest version of Greek Esther.

VI. Ideology and Exegesis

In the successive re-workings of the Greek narrative, one may trace the deployment of various literary techniques (Wills, 'Jewish Novellas', p. 225). Dorothy (*Books*, p. 113) has identified parallels with Greek literary models, specifically Greek historiography. Broadly speaking, the small pluses in LXX serve to historicise the novella: details are filled in, so that less is left to the reader's imagination. Consistent with Dorothy's

analysis are the parallels between Greek Esther and the Hellenistic sentimental romance (or Greek novel). In this respect LXX admits comparison to the so-called Jewish novellas—Judith, Tobit, Joseph, and Aseneth (see Wills, *Jewish Novel*, pp. 116–28). These works are characterised *inter alia* by their erotic focus, an aspect of the Esther narrative that is subtly enhanced in LXX (Boyd-Taylor, ‘Esther’s Great Adventure’). The novelistic ambience of the translation is, in turn, considerably heightened by the Additions, which bring disparate literary forms into play. Such a creative use of subgenres is typical of the Greek novel.

Clines (*Esther Scroll*, p. 169) cautions against looking exclusively to Greek literature for parallels. For him the primary effect of the Additions is to assimilate Esther to a ‘scriptural norm’. Like the court histories of Ezra and Nehemiah, the plot of Greek Esther pivots on a few key interventions by God (D 8 and F 6; cf. Ezra 1.1, 5; 6.22; Neh. 2.8, 12, 20). Clines (*Esther Scroll*, p. 171) further suggests that the prayers of Addition C refashion the narrative into the form of an exemplary tale, in which Mordecai and Esther become models of Jewish piety. Prayers of supplication were common in Second Temple Judaism (e.g., Ezra 9.6–15; Neh. 1.5–11; 9.6–37; Dan. 9.4–19; Jdt. 9).

It is often contended that Additions A and F superimpose an apocalyptic framework upon Greek Esther. Moore (‘Origin’, p. 388) points to the dragon motif (2 Bar. 29.3–8; 2 Esd. 6.52) and the eschatological ‘Day-of-the-Lord’ imagery (Joel 2.2, 10–11; Zeph. 1.15). Furthermore there are parallels with the book of Daniel, where the meaning of history is likewise conveyed through dreams and their interpretation (Clines, *Esther Scroll*, pp. 171–72). Yet these parallels should not be pressed too far. Wills (*Jewish Novel*, pp. 116–17), who describes Mordecai’s dream sequence as ‘mock-apocalyptic’, views its function as primarily literary. Like many of the dreams and oracles in Greek novels, it serves to foreshadow the events of the narrative.

a. Jewish–Gentile Relations

Johnson (*Historical Fictions*, p. 43) views the literary strategy of LXX as fundamentally ideological. By enhancing the historical verisimilitude of the narrative the translator reinforces its central truth claim—national deliverance—a claim which is not itself historical, but moral, and bound up with the question of Jewish identity in the diaspora. The royal edicts

(Additions B and E) are particularly apposite to Johnson's discussion, as they provide the reader with documentary evidence for the claims of the narrative, while elaborating certain key themes.

Building on Johnson's insight, Hacham ('3 Maccabees', p. 784) suggests that a focal concept of the edicts is Gentile hostility. In contrast to Hebrew Esther, which exudes Jewish confidence, LXX envisions a situation of insecurity. The author, perhaps taking his cue from 3 Maccabees, speaks to the anxieties of diaspora Jews, encouraging them to place their hope in royal recognition of Jewish loyalty ('3 Maccabees', p. 784). This emphasis on loyalty is not exclusive to Additions B and E. The translator of LXX twice refers to the *εὐνοία* of Mordecai (2.23 and 6.4). In Hellenistic royal propaganda *εὐνοία* represents the virtue *par excellence* of a loyal subject. Harvey (*Finding*, p. 226) concludes that the conscientious loyalty of Mordecai is underscored throughout the Greek version.

Hacham ('3 Maccabees', pp. 782–83) observes that the author of Hebrew Esther felt secure enough in his environment to portray Jews killing non-Jews. In 3 Maccabees, by contrast, only renegade Jews are killed. According to some commentators the vengeance of the Jews upon their enemies is toned down in LXX. The following texts are cited: At 8.11, where the Jews are given explicit permission to annihilate their enemies, LXX merely relates that they were to treat them as they wished. Whereas at 8.13 the Jews take vengeance (מקנן) on their enemies, in LXX they wage war against them (πολεμῆσαι). The Hebrew text of 9.5, which refers to the slaughter of five hundred people, has no counterpart in the Greek. At 9.16 the Hebrew records seventy-five thousand deaths, the Greek only fifteen thousand. While one should not make too much of these differences, LXX does appear to avoid inflammatory language. This would suggest that the translator was negotiating the very sort of social and political tensions evident in 3 Maccabees.

b. Religious Themes

Greek Esther is characterised by its explicit religious themes. Whereas MT makes no mention of God, LXX contains four references in parallel verses: (a) At 2.20 the Hebrew narrator states that Esther had not revealed her ethnic identity to the court. In LXX we learn that Mordecai had commanded her φοβεῖσθαι τὸν θεόν καὶ ποιεῖν τὰ προστάγματα αὐτοῦ 'to fear God and to do his ordinances'. (b) At 4.8 Mordecai, through an

intermediary, charges Esther to entreat the king on behalf of her people. To this LXX adds that Mordecai bid her ἐπικάλεσαι τὸν κύριον ‘Call upon the Lord’. (c) At 6.1, on the night before Haman plans to hang Mordecai, the king is sleepless. According to the Greek narrator, ὁ δὲ κύριος ἀπέστησεν τὸν ὕπνον ἀπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως τὴν νύκτα ἐκείνην ‘But the Lord kept sleep from the king that night’. (d) At 6.13 Haman’s wife and friends tell him that if Mordecai is Jewish, Haman cannot prevail against him. The Greek adds, ὅτι θεὸς ζῶν μετ’ αὐτοῦ ‘because a living god is with him’. To the above list, we may add the following reference to the Law of Israel, also absent in MT: At 8.11 the king’s decree permits the Jews of every city to assemble and defend themselves. In Greek Esther they are ordered χρῆσθαι τοῖς νόμοις αὐτῶν ἐν πάσῃ πόλει ‘to live in accordance with their laws in every city’.

This is no small difference, and various explanations have been offered. On the theory of Clines (*Esther Scroll*, p. 109), MT represents a late recension in which there has been an excision of all religious language. This is an interesting hypothesis, yet speculative. On balance these passages in LXX look like the elaboration of a shorter text. In most instances one finds, in addition to the reference to God, other motifs specifically associated with the Greek translation. Fox (*Character*, p. 270) emphasises their overall impact upon the understanding of history conveyed by LXX: they foreground the sacral dimension of events, in which the true meaning of crisis and deliverance is found.

A characteristic emphasis of the pluses in LXX is Jewish piety. The translator stresses that Esther continued to adhere to her religious practices when she entered the palace (2.20). Mordecai bids Esther to turn to God in prayer as well as to ask the king for help (4.8). Such acts of piety and prayer, it is implied, are pivotal in delivering the people from crisis (Fox, *Character*, p. 271). This theme, absent in MT, is greatly developed in Addition C.

Commentators generally emphasise two aspects of the prayers of Mordecai and Esther: they underline the significance of supplicatory prayer within the larger narrative; and, they establish the Jewish piety of the protagonists. The reader learns that Mordecai’s refusal to bow to Haman was religiously motivated (C 5-7), and that Esther abhors her position in the Gentile court (C 26-29). Menn (‘Prayer’, p. 89) suggests that Esther’s prayer presents an idealisation of the Jewish religious self

as a subject of the divine King. It thus clarifies by contradistinction what it means for a Jew to be the subject of a Hellenistic king. Through her prayer, Esther's self-identity is firmly rooted in what Menn ('Prayer', p. 90) calls the 'scripturalised past', i.e., the collective memory of the Jewish community. As Clines (*Esther Scroll*, p. 169) has noted, Addition C assimilates the story of Esther and Mordecai to the emerging 'scriptural norm' defined by Pentateuchal law, the observance of which had become central to the piety of certain circles within Hellenistic Judaism.

c. Dream and interpretation

Additions A and F—the dream of Mordecai and its interpretation—invite the reader to interpret the intervening narrative from an apocalyptic perspective. The story of Esther and Mordecai is reconstrued as the temporal enactment of a cosmic struggle already resolved by God on a higher plane (Fox, *Character*, p. 270). Moore ('Origin', p. 390) observes that the clash between 'the righteous nation' and 'every nation' depicted in Mordecai's dream is not unlike the relationship between 'the sons of light' and 'the sons of darkness' in the Essene literature. Deliverance is not achieved through the efforts of human actors, but through divine agency.

Yet while there is a decidedly apocalyptic valence to Mordecai's dream, Fox (*Character*, p. 270) is correct in stressing that the emphasis is on the past rather than the future. Jobes (*Alpha-Text*, pp. 183–93) sharpens the focus by directing our attention to the intertextuality of the imagery, identifying a series of allusions to Jeremiah 28 (LXX). On this reading, Additions A and F construe the intervening narrative as a fulfilment of Jeremiah's promise of restored covenant blessing—the reversal of events at the heart of the story of Esther and Mordecai marks the passing of God's judgement.

d. The Festival of Purim

The colophon (F 11) to LXX identifies it as a letter concerning *Φρουραί*. The Greek word, which in LXX replaces פּוּרִים in 9.26, 28, 29, transliterates the Aramaic plural פּוּרִיאַ (Torrey, 'Older', p. 6). While Purim has its roots in ancient Near Eastern seasonal festivals, the earliest evidence for its institution is the book of Esther, which presents a compelling myth

of origins: following their victory over Haman, Mordecai and Esther write letters instituting Purim as an annual commemoration (MT 9.1-19) (Burns, 'Special Purim', p. 4).

Moore ('Origin', p. 390) contends that through its apocalyptic frame LXX shifts the focus of the narrative away from Purim, but this reading of the text seems doubtful. There are in fact various indications that the Greek version carries forward the etiological project of MT. It thus belongs to a small group of Hellenistic writings which attempt to legitimate an extra-Pentateuchal festival (Bickerman, 'Colophon', p. 355). On Bickerman's hypothesis the spread of Purim was the work of private propaganda. Alexander and Alexander ('Image', p. 93), on the other hand, suggest that the festival was promoted in the Greek-speaking diaspora by the Hasmoneans (an interpretation which finds support at 2 Macc. 15.36). They propose that this occurred in two stages: first, the translation of canonical Esther into Greek; then LXX (including the Additions), a second edition of the Greek narrative aiming to bring it in line with the religious sensibilities of Alexandrian Jews (Alexander and Alexander, 'Image', p. 94).

It is plausible that LXX was influenced by the religious propaganda of the Hasmoneans (Burns, 'Special Purim', p. 18). There are subtle indications of this in the text. Thus, while MT places Purim on the day following the Jewish victory (8.7-18), a day of rest, LXX places it on the day itself (9.16-19). In this way, Purim is identified with Hanukkah and the Day of Nicanor, both of which commemorate recent Hasmonean military victories (Burns, 'Special Purim', p. 17). A Hasmonean milieu is certainly consistent with the thematic emphases of the Greek narrative, particularly the tension between Israel and the nations (Collins, *Between Athens*, p. 111).

VII. Reception History

The early reception of Greek Esther was undoubtedly bound up with the observance of Purim, the focus of which is public recitation of the Esther scroll (Burns, 'Special Purim', p. 4). Burns ('Special Purim', pp. 5-6) stresses the historical significance of this *Sitz im Leben*. The connection between text and ritual gave the narrative a high level of popular

recognition. It is telling that the author of 2 Maccabees is able to use Purim—referred to as ‘Mordecai’s Day’—as a point of reference in narrating the institution of the Day of Nicanor (2 Macc. 15.36). Not only is familiarity with the story of Mordecai and Esther presumed, but the status of Purim as an established institution (Burns, ‘Special Purim’, p. 13).

A key document for the reception of LXX is the colophon, which locates the text in Alexandria in the first century B.C.E. Here it presumably played a role in promoting Purim. For Bickerman (‘Colophon’, p. 343), the generic features of the colophon attest to a specific social and literary context. The influence of Greek philology in Alexandria had precipitated a demand among literate Jews for authentic texts. Thus the colophon is at pains to stress that an original Hebrew text really existed and was used for the translation. Moore (*Daniel*, p. 251) suggests that the colophon implies the existence of a rival translation claiming to be the authentic Greek version.

There are strong indications that the early reception of LXX was characterised by revision and redaction. On the minority view that AT is derived from LXX, it is a witness to that history. Material from a variety of Jewish sources, both popular and learned, oral and literary, appear to have supplemented Greek Esther. This process is reflected in certain pluses within Josephus. While some of these may reflect the internal development of the Greek text, the larger ones were probably derived from traditional sources. Yet a caveat is in order: Josephus engaged in a creative reworking of his material, utilising contemporary novelistic methods and introducing apologetic motifs (Feldman, ‘Hellenizations’, p. 170).

By the late first century C.E. Greek Esther enjoyed an authoritative status in some communities. Two early Christian texts are suggestive in this regard. Herod’s boast at Mk 6.23 that he will give Herodias whatever she wishes, ‘even half of my kingdom’, may paraphrase Artaxerxes’ offer to Esther (5.3, 6; 7.2). The reference to Esther—‘who was perfect in faith’—by Clement of Rome (*1 Clem.* 55.6), implies knowledge of Addition C. It is conceivable that Greek Esther underwent redaction within Christian circles. Jobes (*Alpha-Text*, p. 191) raises the possibility that the extant form of Mordecai’s dream may come from such a milieu.

While the story of Mordecai and Esther no doubt remained popular among Christians, the learned tradition of the church shows very little interest in the text.

On the assumption that the copy of the Esther scroll in POxy. 4443 is Jewish, there is evidence that Greek Esther was still being copied by Jews as late as the early second century C.E. Burns ('Special Purim', p. 29) argues that the Mishnah provides indirect support for the continued use of Greek Esther in the Purim ritual in the early third century C.E. It is possible that the use of LXX (or some textual congener) by Greek-speaking Jews continued into the Amoraic era.

The Additions found their way into Hebrew-Aramaic tradition through a medieval Hebrew paraphrase of the works of Josephus: the *Sefer Yosippon*, written sometime between the ninth to tenth century in southern Italy (Dönitz, 'Sefer Yosippon', p. 223). The redactor of *Sefer Yosippon* wove this material into a history of the Jewish people from the Exile to the destruction of the Second Temple. The chapter on Esther is exclusively concerned with the Additions (Dönitz, 'Sefer Yosippon', p. 229). The fact that it includes a version of Mordecai's dream (Addition A) shows that the redactor drew on Greek Esther, or a tradition based on it, as the dream is not found in Josephus (Moore, *Daniel*, p. 387). Dönitz observes that this adaptation of the Greek version became part of the collective memory of medieval Jews, helping to shape their self-identity—answering the age-old question of how to cope with diaspora existence ('Sefer Yosippon', p. 231).

Bibliography

- Alexander, P., and L. Alexander, 'The Image of the Oriental Monarch in the Third Book of Maccabees', in T. Rajak, S. Pearce, J. Aitken and J. Dines (eds.), *Jewish Perspectives on Hellenistic Rulers* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2007), pp. 92–109.
- Bickerman, E.J., 'The Colophon of the Greek Book of Esther', *JBL* 63 (1944), pp. 339–62.
- 'Notes on the Greek Book of Esther', *PAAJR* 20 (1950), pp. 101–33.
- Boyd-Taylor, C., 'Esther's Great Adventure: Reading the LXX version of the Book of Esther in Light of Its Assimilation to the Conventions of the Greek Romantic Novel', *BIOCS* 30 (1997), pp. 81–113.
- Burns, J.E., 'The Special Purim and the Reception of the Book of Esther in the Hellenistic and Early Roman Eras', *JSJ* 37 (2006), pp. 1–34.

The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint

- Carruthers, J. *Esther through the Centuries* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2008).
- Cavalier, C., *La Bible d'Alexandrie*. Vol. XII, *Esther* (Paris: Cerf, 2012).
- Clines, D.J.A., *The Esther Scroll* (JSOTSup 30; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1984).
- Collins, J.J., *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora* (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000).
- De Troyer, K., *The End of the Alpha Text: Translation and Narrative Technique in MT 8:1-17, LXX 8:1-17, and AT 7:14-41* (SBLSCS 48; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000).
- 'Esther in Text- and Literary-Critical Paradise', in S.W. Crawford and L.J. Green-spoon (eds.), *The Book of Esther in Modern Research* (London: T&T Clark, 2003), pp. 31–49.
- Rewriting the Sacred Text: What the Old Greek Texts Tell Us about the Literary Growth of the Bible* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003).
- Dönitz, S., 'Sefer Yosippon and the Greek Bible', in N. de Lange, J. Krivoruchko and C. Boyd-Taylor (eds.), *Jewish Reception of Greek Bible Versions* (TSMEMJ 23; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009).
- Dorothy, C.V., *The Books of Esther: Structure, Genre and Textual Integrity* (JSOTSup 187; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997).
- Feldman, L.H., 'Hellenizations in Josephus' Version of Esther', *TAPA* 101 (1970), pp. 143–70.
- Fox, M.V., *Character and Ideology in the Book of Esther* (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001).
- The Redaction of the Books of Esther: On Reading Composite Texts* (SBLMS 40; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991).
- Fritzsche, O.F., *Libri Apocryphi Veteri Testamenti graece. Recensuit et cum commentario critico, ed.* (Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1871).
- Frolov, S., 'Two Eunuchs, Two Conspiracies, and One Loyal Jew: The Narrative of Botched Regicide in Esther as Text- and Redaction-Critical Test Case', *VT* 52 (2002), pp. 304–25.
- Hacham, N., '3 Maccabees and Esther: Parallels, Intertextuality, and Diaspora Identity', *JBL* 126 (2007), pp. 765–85.
- Haelewyck, J.-C., 'The Relevance of the Old Latin Version for the Septuagint, with Special Emphasis on the Book of Esther', *JTS* 57 (2006), pp. 439–73.
- Hanhart, R. (ed.), *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum*, Vol. VIII.3, *Esther* (2nd ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983 [1966]).
- Harvey, C.D., *Finding Morality in the Diaspora: Moral Ambiguity and Transformed Morality in the Books of Esther* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003).
- Jacob, B., 'Das Buch Esther bei dem LXX', *ZAW* 10 (1890), pp. 241–98.
- Jobes, K., *The Alpha-Text of Esther: Its Character and Relationship to the Masoretic Text* (SBLDS 153; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996).

- ‘Esther’, in A. Pietersma and B. Wright (eds.), *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), pp. 424–40.
- Johnson, S.R., *Historical Fictions and Hellenistic Jewish Identity: Third Maccabees in Its Cultural Context* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004).
- Kahana, H., *Esther: Juxtaposition of the Septuagint Translation with the Hebrew Text* (CBET 40; Leuven: Peeters, 2005).
- Kossmann, R., *Die Esthernovelle: Von erzählten zur Erzählung* (VTSup 79; Leiden: Brill, 2000).
- Lagarde, P.A. de, *Librorum Veteris Testamenti Canonicorum Pars Prior Graece* (Göttingen: Dieterich, 1883).
- Martin, R.A., ‘Syntax Criticism of the LXX Additions to Esther’, *JBL* 94 (1975), pp. 65–72.
- Menn, E., ‘Prayer of the Queen: Esther’s Religious Self in the Septuagint’, in D. Brakke, M.L. Satlow, and S. Weitzman (eds.), *Religion and the Self in Antiquity* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2005), pp. 70–90.
- Miller, T., *Three Versions of Esther: Their Relationship to Anti-Semitic and Feminist Critique of the Story* (Leuven: Peeters, 2014).
- Moore, C.A., *Daniel, Esther and Jeremiah: The Additions* (AB 44; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1977).
- Esther* (AB 7B; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1971).
- ‘A Greek Witness to a Different Text of Esther’, *ZAW* 79 (1967), pp. 351–58.
- ‘On the Origin of the LXX Additions to the Book of Esther’, *JBL* 92 (1973), pp. 383–86.
- Paton, L.B., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Esther* (ICC; New York: Scribner, 1908).
- Torrey, C.C., ‘The Older Book of Esther’, *HTR* 37 (1944), pp. 1–40.
- Tov, E., ‘The “Lucianic” Text of the Canonical and Apocryphal Sections of Esther: A Rewritten Biblical Book’, *Textus* 10 (1982), pp. 1–25.
- ‘The LXX Translation of Esther: A Paraphrastic Translation of MT or a Free Translation of a Rewritten Version?’, in A. Houtman, A. de Jong, and M. Misset-van de Weg (eds.), *Empsychoi Logoi: Religious Innovations in Antiquity* (Festschrift P.W. van der Horst; AJEC 73; Leiden: Brill, 2008), pp. 507–26.
- ‘Three Strange Books of the LXX: 1 Kings, Esther and Daniel Compared with Similar Rewritten Compositions from Qumran and Elsewhere’, in M. Karrer and W. Kraus (eds.), *Die Septuaginta: Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten* (WUNT 219; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), pp. 369–93.
- Vialle, C., *Une Analyse Comparée d’Esther TM et LXX: Regard sur deux Récits d’une Même Histoire* (Leuven: Peeters, 2010).
- Wills, L.M., *The Jewish Novel in the Ancient World* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1995).
- ‘The Jewish Novellas’, in J.R. Morgan and R. Stoneman (eds.), *Greek Fiction* (London: Routledge, 1994), pp. 223–38.

Judith

Jeremy Corley

Editions

(a) Standard Greek Editions

Göttingen, vol. VIII.4, *Judith* (Hanhart, 1979).

Cambridge, vol. III.1, *Esther, Judith, Tobit* (Brooke, McLean, and Thackeray, 1940).

Rahlfs-Hanhart, vol. I, pp. 973–1001.

Swete, vol. II, pp. 781–814.

(b) Other Greek Editions

Sprachlicher Schlüssel zu Judit (Arzt *et al.*, 1997).¹

(c) Modern Translations

NETS (Boyd-Taylor, 2007), pp. 441–55.

LXX.D (Engel, 2009), pp. 618–34.

La Biblia Griega, vol. II (Fernández Marcos *et al.*, 2011), pp. 691–726.

I. General Characteristics

The book of Judith opens by describing an invasion of Syria and Palestine by Nebuchadnezzar's general Holofernes. In response, the high priest Joakim orders the Jews to seize the mountain passes of Samaria, blocking enemy access to Jerusalem. Holofernes lays siege to the Jewish city of Bethulia, depriving it of food and water. The story then introduces the heroine Judith, a devout and beautiful widow, who boldly goes out to the Assyrian camp. By a careful plan she beguiles Holofernes into

1. Göttingen base text with grammatical analysis.

receiving her into his tent. Intending to have intercourse with her, he first becomes very drunk, whereupon she beheads him with his sword. The Assyrians flee when they realise that their general is dead, while Judith receives acclaim from her people.

Like the books of Esther and Tobit, the tale of Judith is a Jewish novella from the Second Temple period. Various historical problems in the story suggest it is a work of pious fiction (Moore, *Judith*, pp. 46–49; Otzen, *Tobit and Judith*, pp. 81–87; Gera, *Judith*, pp. 26–44). Nebuchadnezzar is said to rule the Assyrians in Nineveh (Jdt. 1.1), rather than the Babylonians (2 Kgs 24.1), even though Nineveh was destroyed in 612 B.C.E. by King Nabopolassar before Nebuchadnezzar's accession. Moreover, whereas Nebuchadnezzar took the Israelites into exile (2 Kgs 25.8-11), the narrative purports to describe the time after the Israelites had returned from exile (Jdt. 4.3; 5.18-19).

Geographical problems include a 300-mile march in three days (Jdt. 2.21), as well as the location of Bethulia (7.6-7). Since the otherwise unknown place is near Dothan (4.6) and since Judith's prayer focuses on the rape of Dinah (9.2-4), it is often suggested that the city represents Shechem, located near the ancient Tel Balata. The name Balata may have been assimilated to the Hebrew noun בתולה (*bethulah* = 'virgin') for literary reasons, since Judith fears that the city will suffer rape as did the 'virgin' Dinah (9.2). An alternative suggestion that the name represents בית אֵלוֹהַּ (*Beth-Eloah* = house of God) conflicts with the author's view that the 'house of God' is in Jerusalem (9.1) rather than Bethulia.

Personal names in the book of Judith are often significant. While the heroine bears a name that means 'Jewess', she is really a female counterpart to Judas Maccabeus. Just as his victory over an alien enemy in 161 B.C.E. led to the beheading of Nicanor (1 Macc. 7.47), so she decapitates Holofernes (Jdt. 13.8). The name Holofernes in English translations is based on the Latin *Holofernis* (with initial H- as in Latin *Hester* for Esther), but the Greek actually has Olophernes (Ὀλοφέρνης), a variant of the name of more than one foreign general. According to Diodorus Siculus, the Persian King Artaxerxes III (358–338 B.C.E.) had a Cappadocian general named Orophernes (*Hist.* 31.19.2-3), as well as a trusted advisor called Bagoas (*Hist.* 16.47.3-4; cf. Jdt. 12.11). The name Achior (Jdt. 5.5) may reflect the Mesopotamian sage Ahiqar (Tob. 1.21-22).

As high priest (Jdt. 4.6), Joakim may echo Ezra's contemporary, the fifth-century high priest Joakim (2 Esd. 22.26 = Neh. 12.26), since in Jdt. 4.3 the people of Judah had only recently returned from exile.

II. Time and Place of Composition

While the time of composition is unknown, most scholars date the book of Judith between 161 and 63 B.C.E. (Moore, *Judith*, pp. 67–70; Otzen, *Tobit and Judith*, pp. 132–35). The earliest text fragment is Cairo Ostrakon 215 from the late third century C.E., containing parts of 15.1–7 (Schwartz, 'Un fragment'), while the book as a whole appears a century later in the major uncial MSS: Vaticanus (B), Sinaiticus (S) and Alexandrinus (A). A fourth-century Oxyrhynchus fragment also survives (POxy. 75.5020), containing Jdt. 6.16–17 and 7.1–2. At the end of the first century C.E. Judith is already mentioned with Esther in *1 Clem.* 55.4–5. Since aspects of the story reflect Hasmonean rule without any clear allusion to the Roman occupation of Palestine, the work probably originated before Pompey's capture of Jerusalem (63 B.C.E.).

The narrative seems to postdate Judas Maccabeus's victory over Nicanor (161 B.C.E.), since echoes of 1 Macc. 7.43–50 occur in Judith 13–16. If Judith depends on a Greek form of 1 Maccabees, it can hardly originate before the death of John Hyrcanus (104 B.C.E.), since his reign is summed up in 1 Macc. 16.23–24. Furthermore, it is likely that John Hyrcanus's defeat of Samaria by 107 B.C.E. occurred sometime before the book's composition, since Samaria appears to be under the control of Jerusalem (Jdt. 4.4–7). Hence the book was probably composed between 104 and 63 B.C.E.

Possible echoes of LXX Esther offer further clues. In the Greek, but not in the Hebrew, both heroines are careful not to eat defiled food (Est. 14.17 = C28; Jdt. 12.2); both pray before carrying out their dangerous enterprise (Est. 14.3–19 = C14–30; Jdt. 9.2–14; 13.4–7); and both beautify themselves before approaching the pagan leader (Est. 15.1 = D1; Jdt. 10.3). If Judith depends on LXX Esther, and if the colophon dates LXX Esther to either 114 or 77 B.C.E. (depending on the identity of 'Ptolemy and Cleopatra' in LXX Est. 11.1 = F11), this year may indicate the earliest possible date for Judith.

The story was perhaps propaganda supporting the leadership of Alexandra Salome (who reigned 76–67 B.C.E.), since Judith somewhat resembles this queen as depicted by Josephus (Ilan, *Integrating Women*, pp. 150–51), or more likely a eulogistic narrative composed soon after her death (Boccaccini, ‘Tigranes’, pp. 66–69). As the only female monarch in Jerusalem during the Second Temple period, Alexandra Salome (also known as Shelamzion) wielded sole power, just as Judith appears as Israel’s undisputed leader. Both heroines showed courage in national leadership beyond female stereotypes (Jdt. 13.20; Josephus, *Ant.* 13.16.6 §430). Judith assumed a strong role when the city elders were helpless (Jdt. 8.9–11), just as Alexandra Salome ‘exposed the folly of those men who continually fail to maintain sovereign power’ (*Ant.* 13.16.6 §430). Both heroines brought peace to Israel (Jdt. 16.25; *Ant.* 13.16.6 §432) and enjoyed widespread popularity (Jdt. 16.21; *Ant.* 13.16.1 §407). Indeed, the narrative could be a fictionalised retelling of the queen’s handling of the threatened invasion of the Holy Land by the Armenian king Tigranes in 69 B.C.E. (Rocca, ‘Book’, pp. 85–98; Boccaccini, ‘Tigranes’, pp. 59–60). To be sure, Alexandra Salome did not always follow Judith’s devout path, since Josephus reports her craving for power and her disregard of justice (*Ant.* 13.16.6 §§430–31), whereas Judith was a God-fearing woman who retired quietly after saving her nation (Jdt. 8.31; 16.21–25).

The place of composition is probably the land of Israel, especially in view of the various geographical errors regarding foreign territory (Otzen, *Tobit and Judith*, pp. 87–90). Concern for the sanctity of the temple (4.13; 5.19; 8.24; 9.1) may indicate Jerusalem as a possible place of origin, though the focus on Samaria may suggest central Palestine instead.

III. Language

The story’s Koine Greek is strongly influenced by Hebrew syntax and idioms (Moore, *Judith*, pp. 66–67), as well as by phraseology from earlier Septuagintal books (Joosten, ‘Language’, pp. 6–9; Corley, ‘Septuagintalisms’, pp. 70–71). Judith makes repeated use of biblical expressions, with 19 cases of υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ (‘sons of Israel’, as in 4.1, 8) and 11 cases of Ἴδοὺ (‘behold’, as in 3.2, 3). Hebrew idioms with ‘face’

appear: ἀπὸ προσώπου (‘from the face of’, 10×, as in 6.2), κατὰ πρόσωπον (‘before the face of’, 14×, as in 7.6), and πρὸ προσώπου (‘in front of the face of’, 4×, as in 8.15). Admittedly, a Septuagintal idiom that reflects Hebraic diction may also be Hellenistic usage, such as the phrase ‘before the face of the sanctuary’ (κατὰ πρόσωπον τοῦ ναοῦ, 4.11); compare the expression [κα]τὰ πρόσωπον τοῦ ἱεροῦ (‘before the face of the temple’), found in a Ptolemaic-era papyrus (PPetr. 3.1.2.8).

Among other Hebraic idioms are prepositional phrases like ‘in the eyes of’ (12.14); the oath formula ‘as the Lord lives’ (13.16); the idiom ‘from small to great’ (13.4, 13); and chronological expressions such as ‘a month of days’ (3.10) and ‘many days’ (5.8, 16). Hebraic syntactical features include recurrent parataxis, especially the phrase ‘and it happened’ (5.22; 10.1); a cognate participle or noun with a verb, imitating the Hebrew infinitive absolute (e.g., 2.13; 6.4); a pleonastic construction in relative clauses (5.19; 7.10); and the expression ‘and now’ (e.g., 5.19, 20). Such frequent Hebraisms have often been viewed as evidence of a lost Hebrew original, though most of these features can be classed as Septuagintalisms.

By contrast with classical writers, rarely does the author of Judith employ genitive absolute phrases (e.g., 4.7), subordinate clauses (e.g., 5.19; 7.10), and participial phrases (e.g., 2.28). The pluperfect is often represented periphrastically (e.g., 4.3, 5) by the imperfect of the verb ‘to be’ with the perfect participle (Arzt *et al.*, *Sprachlicher*, pp. 42–43). The uncial MSS prefer the classical οὐδέν (‘nothing’, as in 6.9) but sometimes have οὐθέν (‘nothing’, 8.13). For ‘lesser’, Jdt. 9.11 employs the Attic form ἐλάττων (as in Exod. 16.17–18; 2 Macc. 5.5) rather than ἐλάσσω (as in Gen. 1.16; Wis. 9.5). However, Judith thrice uses θαρσέω (‘take courage’, 7.30; 11.1, 3) rather than the Attic θαρρέω (found in Bar. 4.21, 27 B; Prov. 31.11 S). While most Lucianic MSS of Judith follow normal Septuagintal usage of the classical numeral δώδεκα (‘twelve’), Vaticanus and Alexandrinus have the Hellenistic form δέκα δύο (Jdt. 2.5; 7.2), as in LXX Chronicles (e.g., 1 Chron. 9.22; 2 Chron. 33.1) and in papyri from Ptolemaic Egypt.

Some unusual verb forms appear in the major uncial MSS. In Jdt. 7.10 we find the third person plural perfect active πέποιθαν = ‘they rely’ (intransitive second perfect), though some later MSS correct this form to

πεποιθασιν (as in Isa. 59.4). The third person plural imperfect active form ἐδίδοσαν ('they were giving') appears in Jdt. 7.21 (as in Ezek. 23.42; 3 Macc. 2.31), though the Lucianic MSS change this form to ἐδίδουν (as in 2 Chron. 27.5). Sometimes the author overlooks precise grammatical congruence when using a *constructio ad sensum*, since we find the grammatically singular noun λαός ('a people') construed with a plural verb (e.g., Jdt. 7.10, 23; cf. 2 Esd. 18.1 = Neh. 8.1). Another singular subject, the Hebraic idiom πᾶς ἀνὴρ ('every man'), is construed with a plural verb (4.9; 6.12), but the feminine counterpart πᾶσα γυνή ('every woman', 15.12), correctly takes the singular verb συνέδραμεν ('ran together'), even though plural verbs follow.

In comparison with classical texts, there is a scarcity of Greek particles in Judith (Moore, *Judith*, pp. 92–93), though a similar shortage occurs in some other Septuagintal books. According to Vaticanus, Judith never uses ἄρα ('then'—also absent from LXX Exodus and Esther), οὖν ('therefore'—also absent from LXX Jeremiah and Ezekiel), and τέ ('and'—also absent from LXX Judges and Samuel), though the particle δὴ ('now therefore') appears 14 times.

In Rahlfs-Hanhart, Judith has 43 Septuagintal *hapax legomena*, compared to 42 in Chronicles, 56 in LXX Esther, 59 in Judges, and 90 in 1 Maccabees. The relatively small number may reflect the imitation of Septuagintal style and vocabulary, either as translation-Greek or as original Greek composition. Some *hapax legomena* may be neologisms (e.g., προνουμηνία 'eve of the new moon', 8.6; ὑπερφωνέω 'sing loudly', 15.14), while three lexemes are Persian loanwords (κίδαρις 'turban', 4.15; σατράπης 'governor', 5.2; ἀκινάκης 'Persian-style sword', 13.6; 16.9).

IV. Translation and Composition

It is disputed whether the Greek book of Judith was translated from a lost Hebrew source or whether it was composed in Greek by an author familiar with Hebrew and the LXX (Gera, *Judith*, pp. 79–97). The prevalent view has been that the work is a translation from Hebrew, as evidenced by Hebraic idioms and syntax and by alleged mistranslations

from Hebrew (Moore, *Judith*, pp. 66–67). However, some current scholarship suggests that the book is an original Greek composition by an author who knew Hebrew but often echoed Septuagintal wording (Rakel, *Judit*, pp. 36–40; Joosten, ‘Language’, pp. 2–9; Corley, ‘Septuagintalism’; Schmitz and Engel, *Judit*, pp. 40–43).

In several places, the book quotes the LXX where this differs from the Hebrew. Judith’s prayer addresses God as ‘the Lord who crushes wars’ (κύριος συντρίβων πολέμους, 9.7), using the exact words of LXX Exod. 15.3, even though the Hebrew has a more bellicose phrase: ‘The LORD is a man of war’. The same prayer (9.2) also refers to the rape of Dinah: ‘It shall not be thus’ (οὐχ οὕτως ἔσται), echoing the precise wording of LXX Gen. 34.7, rather than the Hebrew wording: ‘It shall not be *done* thus’. In addition, Judith’s speech to the city elders (8.16 in Codex Venetus) has an inverted quotation of LXX Num. 23.19: ‘Not like a human being is God to be threatened, nor like a son of man to be misled’ (οὐχ ὡς ἄνθρωπος ὁ θεὸς ἀπειληθῆναι οὐδὲ ὡς υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου διαρτηθῆναι), whereas the Hebrew presents Balaam’s assertion differently: ‘God is not a man that he would lie, or a son of man that he would relent’ (Schmitz, *Gedeutete Geschichte*, p. 167; Corley, ‘Septuagintalism’, pp. 70–71).

A Greek origin for the book receives support from similarities of plot and vocabulary with Herodotus’ *Histories* (fifth century B.C.E.), particularly Book 7 (Caponigro, ‘Judith’, pp. 47–59). Both narratives refer to the Babylonians as Assyrians (Jdt. 1.1; *Hist.* 1.178). Nebuchadnezzar orders the conquered nations to signal their submission by offering ‘earth and water’ (γῆν καὶ ὕδωρ, Jdt. 2.7), just as the Persian king Xerxes commands the Greeks (*Hist.* 7.131). Achior’s counsel to Holofernes not to fight the Israelites (Jdt. 5.5–21) has a broad resemblance to Demaratus’s cautioning of Xerxes against attacking the Greeks (*Hist.* 7.101–104). Most significantly, the narrow pass defending the approach to Jerusalem (Jdt. 4.7) seems modeled on Thermopylae (*Hist.* 7.176), since both texts refer to the ‘entry’ (εἴσοδος or ἔσοδος) which is ‘narrow’ (using a form of the adjective στενός or στεινός). When Jdt. 5.1 narrates the closure of the mountain passes, it employs the same word used by Herodotus to describe Thermopylae (δίσοδος ‘pass’, *Hist.* 7.201).

While most of the vocabulary of Judith is drawn from earlier Septuagintal books, a few additional words are borrowed from Herodotus. Some Greek lexemes found only in Judith within the LXX match the

vocabulary of Herodotus (e.g., ἀκινάκης ‘Persian-style sword’, Jdt. 13.6; 16.9; *Hist.* 3.118; 7.54; διακωλύω ‘hinder’, Jdt. 4.7; 12.7; *Hist.* 8.144), while other Septuagintal *hapax legomena* in Judith have cognates in Herodotus (e.g., ὀψοποίημα ‘delicacy’, Jdt. 12.1; cf. ὀψοποιός ‘maker of delicacies’, *Hist.* 9.82). The Septuagintal *hapax legomenon* ὄψια ‘evening’, refers to the time of defeat for an enemy leader in both works (Jdt. 13.1; *Hist.* 7.167). Other words occurring only twice in the LXX also reflect Herodotus’ vocabulary (e.g., διακαρτερέω ‘endure perseveringly’, Jdt. 7.30; 4 *Macc.* 6.9; *Hist.* 3.52; 7.107; εὐωχέομαι ‘feast’, Jdt. 1.16; 3 *Macc.* 6.40; *Hist.* 1.31).

There may be allusions to other Greek writings (Caponigro, ‘Judith’, p. 57). The slaying of Arphaxad (Jdt. 1.13–15) may be derived from the story of the death of Darius III in 330 B.C.E., according to the narrative of Alexander the Great’s successor Ptolemy I as preserved by the second-century C.E. historian Arrian (*Anab.* 3.19–21). In addition, the divine deliverance of a thirsty besieged people (Jdt. 7.30–31) echoes a tale in the Chronicle of Lindos, compiled on the Isle of Rhodes in 99 B.C.E. (Corley, ‘Imitation’, pp. 37–39). In both accounts, a siege leaves the threatened inhabitants very thirsty and promising to surrender within five days if there is no divine intervention (8.9), but the inhabitants are saved. Finally, the language of Judith alludes to the Greek custom of holding a θύρσος or ivy-entwined wand (Jdt. 15.12; cf. 2 *Macc.* 10.7), a practice taken from the cult of Dionysus (Euripides, *Bacch.* 80), as well as the habit of wearing olive wreaths (Jdt. 15.13; cf. Euripides, *Ion* 1433).

V. Key Text-Critical Issues

The text appears in the major uncial MSS: Vaticanus (B), Sinaiticus (S: missing 11.14–18; 12.4, 17; 13.3–8) and Alexandrinus (A), as well as in the eighth-century Codex Venetus (V). Among the minuscule MSS there seem to be four recensions: Origenic (= Hexaplaric); Lucianic; 76–106 (similar to V); 46–64–243–248 (similar to A). The Old Latin and the Syriac are based on an Origenic text form. Greek witnesses often differ in the spelling of place names; for instance, the city in 15.6 is variously named Βατυλουά (Cairo Ostrakon), Βαιτυλουά (BA), Βαιτουλουά (S), Βετυλουά (V), and Βαιτουλία (Lucianic MSS).

Some scribal errors have arisen through dittography. In Jdt. 4.9 BA the expression ‘in great earnestness’ appears twice, but the second occurrence may be an error for ‘with great fasting’, the phrase in the Origenic and Lucianic MSS. In 6.12 the wording ‘upon the summit of the mountain’ occurs twice in one sentence, though the Origenic MSS miss out the first instance. Finally, the phrase ‘in the camp’ appears twice in 12.7, although the awkward second occurrence is omitted by the Origenic witnesses.

Some disputed passages are probably inner-Greek textual corruptions. The Greek MSS of 3.8 have the difficult noun ὄρια (‘borders/territory’), whereas the Syriac represents an original form ἱερά (‘temples’, as in 4.1). In 6.6 BSA the reading λαός (‘people’) makes an awkward parallel with σίδηρος (‘iron sword’), but the versions have a kind of weapon (Latin ‘lance’, Syriac ‘spear’), perhaps representing λόγχη (‘lance’) or γαῖσος (‘javelin’, as in 9.7). Instead of the awkward verb καθήσεται (‘it will be situated’, 8.21 BSA), perhaps the original form was καυθήσεται (‘it will be burned’, MS 319). In 10.3, Sinaiticus probably preserves the earliest reading: ‘She combed (διέξανε) the hairs of her head’, whereas Vaticanus and Alexandrinus replace the Septuagintal *hapax legomenon* διαξαίνω (‘comb’) with the better known verb διατάσσω (‘arrange’): ‘she arranged (διέταξεν) the hairs of her head’.

Scribal euphemism may account for variants depicting Judith’s use of sexual attraction and deceptive words. The uncial MSS of 12.16 bluntly describe Holofernes’ thoughts about Judith, ‘He was observing (ἐτήρει) a time to seduce (ἀπατήσαι) her’, but the Origenic MSS have the weaker statement: ‘He was seeking (ἐζήτει) a time to meet (ἀπαντήσαι) her’. Similarly, Jdt. 10.4 S A reads: ‘She very much beautified herself for the seduction (εἰς ἀπάτησιν) of the eyes of males’, whereas Vaticanus has the euphemistic reading: ‘for the meeting (εἰς ἀπάντησιν) of the eyes of males’.

VI. Ideology and Exegesis

While some scholars suggest that Judith follows the religious practice of the Pharisees (Moore, *Judith*, p. 181), her piety fits more generally into late Second Temple Judaism (Hieke, ‘Torah’, pp. 97–105). She prays at evening and morning (9.1; 12.5-6), as well as in times of particular

need (13.4-7). Moreover, she washes before praying (12.7-9) and regularly practises fasting (8.4-6). Rather than defiling herself with the food of pagans, she consumes her own supply during her stay in the Assyrian camp (12.2, 9). She is also conscious of temple worship, since she prays at the time of the evening sacrifice (9.1) and mentions tithes given to the Jerusalem priests (11.13). However, the term νόμος ('law', plural in 11.12) occurs only once, and the conversion and circumcision of Achior the Ammonite (14.10) is narrated despite the seeming prohibition in Deut. 23.34 (Schmitz and Engel, *Judit*, pp. 383–84).

In portraying the Deity as a God who crushes wars (9.7; 16.2), the author repeatedly calls to mind victorious figures from Israelite history through the literary use of imitation. Indeed, the plot and characterisation in the book make skilful allusions to earlier scriptural books (Dubarle, *Judith*, vol. I, pp. 137–59; Zenger, *Das Buch Judit*, pp. 439–46; Corley, 'Judith', pp. 76–84; Otzen, *Tobit and Judith*, pp. 74–79). Judith has features of many biblical heroines (Sarah, Jael, Deborah, Abigail, and Esther), as Table 1 shows.

Table 1. Judith Compared to Heroines in LXX Books

<i>Motif in Judith</i>	<i>Sarah</i>	<i>Jael/ Deborah</i>	<i>Abigail</i>	<i>Esther</i>
Beauty (8.7)	Gen. 12.11	—	1 Sam. 25.3	Est. 2.7
Deliverance promised by a female hand (9.10)	—	Judg. 4.9	—	Est. 4.13-14
Close encounter with dangerous male leader (12.10–13.8)	Gen. 12.14-15	Judg. 5.24-27	1 Sam. 25.20-31	Est. 2.16-17
Heroine saves her people (13.14)	Gen. 12.17-20	Judg. 4.18-22	1 Sam. 25.34	Est. 7.1-10
Public acclaim of heroine (13.18-20)	—	Judg. 5.24	1 Sam. 25.33	Est. 16.13 = E13
Thanksgiving to God (16.1-17)	—	Judg. 5.1-31	1 Sam. 25.32	—

Interestingly, in contrast to the cases of male–female pairs from earlier biblical books, Judith often begins by taking the female part and ends by imitating the male role. By exerting her God-given power, she changes (as it were) from Sarah to Abraham, from Dinah to Simeon, from Miriam to Moses, from Delilah to Samson, and from Abigail to David. Whereas Judith is initially like Sarah as the endangered woman who eventually ensures the safety of her kinsfolk (Gen. 12.10-20), Judith becomes more like Abraham in defeating the foreign enemy (Gen. 14.14-20), and she is acclaimed with words echoing Melchizedek’s acclamation of Abraham (Gen. 14.19-20; Jdt. 13.18-20). Although Judith faces the danger of rape as experienced by Dinah (Gen. 34.2), she comes to resemble her ancestor Simeon (Dinah’s brother, Jdt. 9.2) in wreaking violent vengeance on a hostile foreigner (Moore, *Judith*, pp. 190–91). While Judith sings God’s praise like Miriam (Jdt. 15.13; Exod. 15.20-21), her saving action is more like that of Moses (Van Henten, ‘Judith’, pp. 232–38). Whereas Judith seems to play Delilah’s role of *femme fatale* to Holofernes, her courageous exploit is more like the activity of Samson. Finally, while Judith’s verbal wisdom imitates Abigail, her bravery in defeating and beheading the foreign fighter resembles the action of David (1 Sam. 17.51; Jdt. 13.8). Table 2 shows how Judith is portrayed with features of several male leaders (Moses, Samson, David, and Judas Maccabeus).

Table 2. Judith Compared to Heroes in LXX Books

<i>Motif in Judith</i>	<i>Moses</i>	<i>Samson</i>	<i>David</i>	<i>Judas Maccabeus</i>
Prayer before victory (13.4-7)	Exod. 14.10-14	Judg. 16.28	1 Sam. 17.45-47	1 Macc. 7.41-42
Beheading of a foreign warrior (13.8)	—	—	1 Sam. 17.51	1 Macc. 7.47
Defeat of Israel’s foes (15.1-7)	Exod. 14.30	Judg. 16.30	1 Sam. 17.51-54	1 Macc. 7.44
Single-handed victory (15.10)	Exod. 14.21-29	Judg. 16.30	1 Sam. 17.50	—
God crushing opposition (16.2)	Exod. 15.3	—	1 Sam. 17.37	1 Macc. 7.42-43

VII. Reception History

No clear historical evidence survives for the use of Judith in Second Temple Judaism (Gera, *Judith*, p. 11). The book's absence among the Dead Sea Scrolls could be due to chance, ideology, or language (if composed in Greek). While the New Testament does not explicitly quote the text, the character of Judith may have influenced the depiction of Mary in Luke's infancy narrative. Just as Uzziah declares to Judith: 'Blessed are you...above all the women on earth' (Jdt. 13.18), so Elizabeth addresses Mary: 'Blessed are you among women' (Lk. 1.42). Thereafter, Mary's song of praise (the Magnificat) has echoes of Judith's canticle, since Mary imitates Judith in singing of God's deliverance of the weak (Jdt. 16.11; Lk. 1.48). Judith also foreshadows the devout widow Anna, spending her days in prayer and fasting (Jdt. 8.4-6; Lk. 2.37), until she sees Israel's redemption and utters praise to God (Jdt. 15.14-16.17; Lk. 2.38).

The earliest undisputed reference to the narrative appears around 96 C.E. in the mention of Judith and Esther as heroines of faith in *I Clem.* 55.4-5. Several church fathers refer to favourite verses from the book; for instance, both Clement of Rome and Origen quote Jdt. 9.11 (*I Clem.* 59.3-4; *Comm. John* 2.22.16), while both Origen and Clement of Alexandria cite Jdt. 8.27 (*Or.* 29.3; *Strom.* 2.35.4). In later patristic thought and monastic art (Anderson, *Judith*, pp. 13-21), Judith serves as a type of humility (Jdt. 16.5). Being present in the LXX, the book of Judith was included in the Christian biblical canon at the Council of Nicea (325 C.E.) and was regarded as canonical in the Latin Church and much of the Greek Church (Moore, *Judith*, pp. 90-91).

Although Jerome did not consider the book canonical, he included it in the Vulgate, though with many additions and changes from the Greek text (Moore, *Judith*, pp. 99-101); for example, in 16.22 Jerome adds a reference to the virtue of chastity, not found in the LXX. Jerome's claim in his *Preface to Judith* that he translated the book from Aramaic in one short night's work is open to question, especially since the Vulgate language sometimes copies vocabulary from the Greek (e.g., Latin *palata* = *παλάθη* 'dried fruit cake', in 10.5).

While the book of Judith is not canonical within Judaism, several medieval Hebrew versions exist (Dubarle, *Judith*, vol. II, pp. 7–97), generally based on a Latin text and sometimes linked to the Feast of Hanukkah. Many Protestant Reformers followed the rabbinic canon by excluding the book, even though Martin Luther’s German Bible had included it.

The figure of Judith is often depicted in Western art (Anderson, *Judith*, pp. 30–88). Scenes from the book were painted by Cranach, Giorgione, Caravaggio, Gentileschi (father and daughter), Botticelli, Veronese, Michelangelo, Vasari, Pellegrini, Liss, Metsys, Allori, Titian, Carracci, Goya, Hemessen, Vernet, and Klimt. The paintings mainly fall into a few categories, such as the beheading of Holofernes (Caravaggio; A. Gentileschi), or Judith and her maid carrying his severed head (Botticelli; Michelangelo).

Oratorios based on the book of Judith were composed by A. Scarlatti (1695), A. Vivaldi (1716), T.A. Arne (1761), W.A. Mozart (1771), and C.H.H. Parry (1888), while A. Honegger wrote an opera (1926) based on the story (Elder, ‘Virgins’, pp. 91–119). Besides a tenth-century Anglo-Saxon poem, the figure of Judith also appears in plays by F. Hebbel (1841), T.B. Aldrich (1896), and A. Bennett (1919).

Recent approaches to the book include the psychological (Efthimiadis-Keith, *Enemy*), the literary (Craven, *Artistry*; Schmitz, *Gedeutete*), feminist (Rakel, *Judit*), art-historical (Anderson, *Judith*), and cultural (Stocker, *Judith*; Brine, *Sword*). The book of Judith still has ample scope for further such research, as well as more traditional linguistic, historical, and theological studies.

Bibliography

- Anderson, J., *Judith* (Paris: Regard, 1997).
- Arzt, P., M. Ernst, W. Niklas, and J. Falzberger, *Sprachlicher Schlüssel zu Judit* (Salzburg: Institut für Neutestamentliche Bibelwissenschaft, 1997).
- Boccaccini, G., ‘Tigranes the Great as “Nebuchadnezzar” in the Book of Judith’, in G.G. Xeravits (ed.), *A Pious Seductress: Studies in the Book of Judith* (DCLS 14; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2012), pp. 55–69.
- Brenner, A. (ed.), *A Feminist Companion to Esther, Judith and Susanna* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995).

- Brine, K.R., E. Ciletti, and H. Lähnemann, *The Sword of Judith: Judith Studies across the Disciplines* (Cambridge: Open Book, 2010).
- Caponigro, M.S., 'Judith, Holding the Tale of Herodotus', in J.C. VanderKam (ed.), *'No One Spoke Ill of Her': Essays on Judith* (SBLEJL 2; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), pp. 47–59.
- Corley, J., 'Imitation of Septuagintal Narrative and Greek Historiography in the Portrait of Holofernes', in G.G. Xeravits (ed.), *A Pious Seductress: Studies in the Book of Judith* (DCLS 14; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2012), pp. 22–54.
- 'Judith: An Unconventional Heroine', *ScrB* 31/2 (2001), pp. 70–85.
- 'Septuagintalisms, Semitic Interference, and the Original Language of the Book of Judith', in J. Corley and V. Skemp (eds.), *Studies in the Greek Bible* (CBQMS 44; Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2008), pp. 65–96.
- Craven, T., *Artistry and Faith in the Book of Judith* (SBLDS 70; Chico: Scholars Press, 1983).
- 'The Book of Judith in the Context of Twentieth-Century Studies of the Apocryphal/Deuterocanonical Books', *CBR* 1 (2003), pp. 187–229.
- Dubarle, A.M., *Judith: Formes et sens des diverses traditions* (AnBib 24; 2 vols.; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1966).
- Efthimiadis-Keith, H., *The Enemy Is Within: A Jungian Psychoanalytic Approach to the Book of Judith* (BIS 67; Leiden: Brill, 2004).
- Elder, L.B., 'Virgins, Viragos and Virtuo(u)si among Judiths in Opera and Oratorio', *JSOT* 92 (2001), pp. 91–119.
- Enslin, M.S., and S. Zeitlin, *The Book of Judith* (JAL 8; Leiden: Brill, 1972).
- Esler, P., 'Ludic History in the Book of Judith: The Reinvention of Israelite Identity?' *Biblical Interpretation* 10 (2002), pp. 107–43.
- Gera, D.L., *Judith* (CEJL; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2013).
- Hanhart, R., *Text und Textgeschichte des Buches Judith* (MSU 14; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979).
- Hanhart, R. (ed.), *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum*. Vol. VIII.4, *Judith* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979).
- Henten, J.W. van, 'Judith as Alternative Leader: A Rereading of Judith 7–13', in A. Brenner (ed.), *A Feminist Companion to Esther, Judith and Susanna* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), pp. 224–52.
- Hieke, T., 'Torah in Judith: Dietary Laws, Purity and other Torah Issues in the Book of Judith', in G. G. Xeravits (ed.), *A Pious Seductress: Studies in the Book of Judith* (DCLS 14; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2012), pp. 97–110.
- Ilan, T., *Integrating Women into Second Temple History* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2001).
- Joosten, J., 'The Original Language and Historical Milieu of the Book of Judith', *Meghillot* 5–6 (2007), pp. 159–76.
- Lubitz, K., '5020. LXX, Judith 6.16-17, 7.1-2', in H. Maehler *et al.* (eds.), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 75 (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 2010), pp. 1–2.
- Moore, C.A., *Judith* (AB 40; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985).

The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint

- Newman, J., *Praying by the Book: The Scripturalization of Prayer in Second Temple Judaism* (SBLEJL 14; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999).
- Otzen, B., *Tobit and Judith* (Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha; London: Continuum, 2002).
- Patterson, D.N., 'Re-Membering the Past: The Purpose of Historical Discourse in the Book of Judith', in P.G. Kirkpatrick and T. Goltz (eds.), *The Function of Ancient Historiography in Biblical and Cognate Studies* (LHBOTS 489; New York: Continuum, 2008), pp. 111–23.
- Rakel, C., *Judit—über Schönheit, Macht und Widerstand im Krieg: Eine feministisch-intertextuelle Lektüre* (BZAW 334; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003).
- Rocca, S., 'The Book of Judith, Queen Sholomzion and King Tigranes of Armenia: A Sadducee Appraisal', *Materia Giudaica* 10/1 (2005), pp. 85–98.
- Schmitz, B., *Gedeutete Geschichte: Die Funktion der Reden und Gebete im Buch Judit* (HBS 40; Freiburg: Herder, 2004).
- Schmitz, B., and H. Engel, *Judit* (HTKAT; Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 2014).
- Schwartz, J., 'Un fragment grec du livre de Judith (sur ostracon)', *RB* 53 (1946), pp. 534–37.
- Stocker, M., *Judith, Sexual Warrior: Women and Power in Western Culture* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998).
- VanderKam, J.C. (ed.), *'No One Spoke Ill of Her': Essays on Judith* (SBLEJL 2; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992).
- Wills, L.M., 'Jewish Novellas in a Greek and Roman Age: Fiction and Identity', *JSJ* 42 (2011), pp. 141–65.
- Xeravits, G.G. (ed.), *A Pious Seductress: Studies in the Book of Judith* (DCLS 14; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2012).
- Zenger, E., *Das Buch Judit* (JSHRZ 1/6; Gütersloh: Mohn, 1981).

Tobit

Loren Stuckenbruck and Stuart Weeks

Editions

- (a) Standard Greek Editions (GI and GII)
Göttingen, vol. VIII.5, *Tobit* (Hanhart, 1983).
Cambridge, vol. III.1, *Esther, Judith, Tobit* (Brooke, McLean, and Thackeray, 1940).¹
Rahlfs-Hanhart, vol. I, pp. 1002–38.
Swete, vol. II, pp. 815–48.
- (b) Other Editions (incl. Manuscripts of GIII, Qumran, and Old Latin)
Polyglotte Tobit-Synopse (Wagner, 2003).
The Book of Tobit (Weeks *et al.*, 2004).
'Tobit' (Fitzmyer, 1995), pp. 1–76, pls. I–X.
'Schøyen Ms. 5234' (Elgvin and Hallermayer, 2006).²
- (c) Modern Translations
NETS (Di Liella, 2007), pp. 456–77.
LXX.D (Ego, 2009), pp. 635–62.
La Biblia Griega, vol. II (Fernández Marcos *et al.*, 2011), pp. 727–84.

A. Preliminary Observations

The Greek witnesses for Tobit reflect three different versions of the book in Greek, and this chapter is therefore divided appropriately. In the initial section, matters which apply to the book as a whole and to the original

1. The text of Tobit is on pp. 85–110 (B) and 111–22 (S).
2. This fragment belongs to the same manuscript as 4Q196.

translation will be presented. Matters pertaining to each of the versions individually will be examined separately afterwards.

The inter-relationship of the textual witnesses is extremely complicated. Five fragmentary manuscripts of the book from Qumran have been published, four in Aramaic (4Q196–199) and one in Hebrew (4Q200); some additional material, initially thought to be from 4Q196 and published as such, is now believed to represent a fifth Aramaic manuscript (4Q196a). Although there are some minor differences between them where they overlap, these all attest what is essentially a single version of the book. That version is close to the one which seems to have underpinned the very diverse and unstable Old Latin tradition, which implies that the Latin texts were translated from a Greek text similar in content to the Qumran manuscripts. No such Greek text was known to scholarship, however, before Tischendorf's publication of Codex Sinaiticus in the nineteenth century. The great majority of Greek manuscripts instead reflect a somewhat different version, which has become the standard Septuagint text of Tobit, but which appears to be a secondary revision of the original Greek translation (known as GI, or the 'Short' text). A small number of late manuscripts, which belong to this version for much of their length, reflect a separate, independent revision between about 6.8 and 13.2. This also underlies the majority Syriac text from 7.11. This revision is known as the 'Third Greek' version, or GIII. Only two Greek witnesses, in fact, contain a text which has been subjected to neither of these revisions: Sinaiticus and the eleventh-century *Βατοπαιδιος* 513 from Mount Athos (MS 319 in the standard system). The latter, however, has an 'unrevised' text only in 3.6–6.16, and although Sinaiticus presents such a text throughout Tobit, it is marred by many serious scribal errors and omissions. This version is known as the 'Long' text, or GII. Further or intermediate Greek versions of the book may also have existed, as it is difficult to align several early papyrus fragments precisely with one or other of the known versions.

Comparison with the Old Latin texts is far from straightforward, since these present many problems of their own, but it is clear that they often reflect a source text which differs from Sinaiticus but are sometimes probably more original than Sinaiticus. Readings from them are sometimes preserved in the other Greek versions. Sinaiticus and MS 319 do not have, therefore, a monopoly on early readings, and do not simply

present us with the original Greek translation; if the text of GII has not been so extensively revised as that of the GI and GIII versions, it is not wholly free of revisions. This fact is also apparent from comparison with the Qumran texts. Although it is important to be clear that the source-text used by the Greek translator was not wholly identical to any of these, occasional agreements between the Qumran manuscripts and GI or GIII against GII point again to the probability that GII has the later reading. In short, then, GII is generally closest to the single, original translation which lies behind all the Greek versions, but we have no witness to that translation which is wholly or largely free of revisions or significant errors. This makes it hard to establish the original text in very many places without resorting to investigation of all the witnesses, and correspondingly difficult to address general matters of translation technique or style. On the other hand, the book does offer unusual opportunities for the study of development and revision within a Greek textual tradition.

I. General Characteristics

Tobit was certainly translated into Greek from a Semitic language, and from a text which was close to the version attested in 4Q196–200. Despite occasional suggestions to the contrary, there is no good reason to suppose that it was translated more than once, or that any of our ancient witnesses has been revised against a Semitic text. If a quite different Aramaic version existed and formed the basis of the Vulgate version, then it has probably not influenced the Greek tradition; Jerome's claim to have used an Aramaic text, must, in any case, be viewed in the light of the pervasive Old Latin influence on his translation, and his inclination to inject language or ideas which are clearly his own.

The character of the original Tobit does not necessitate a date for its composition at, or close to, the seventh century B.C.E., the time at which the story is set. Indeed, the ease with which the text readily appeals both to 'the law' or 'book of Moses' and to individual prophets suggests a time at least after the composition of Chronicles (see 2 Chron. 23.18)—so probably no earlier than the latter part of the fourth century B.C.E. On the other hand, the composition must be assigned to a time before the palaeographical dating of the Dead Sea manuscripts (100 B.C.E. to 25 C.E.). Since Tobit's *post eventum* prediction of events (14.3-7) makes no

mention of the turbulence in Jerusalem and persecution of the Jews before and during the Maccabean war (14.5), the book was probably composed before 175 B.C.E. Most scholars thus date the book to between the late fourth to the early second century B.C.E., while some more narrowly specify a range of 225 to 175 B.C.E. It would not be surprising to find Jewish compositions in either Hebrew or Aramaic during that period, and since the middle of the nineteenth century, the question of original language has been discussed in relation to several issues. First, there are references to Tobit among patristic authors. While Origen maintained that the Jews do not have the books of Judith and Tobit ‘among the apocrypha in Hebrew’ (*Ep. ad Africanum* 19), Jerome claimed that the book was written ‘in Chaldee’ (Aramaic; see *Ep. ad Chromatium*). While pointing in the direction of Aramaic, these statements do no more than to suggest that Tobit was circulating in Aramaic during the early centuries of the Common Era. Second, as noted above, the Dead Sea Scrolls have yielded five manuscripts preserving Tobit, four in Aramaic and one in Hebrew. While the greater number of extant Aramaic materials does not in itself resolve the question of original language in favour of Aramaic, the several instances of Hebrew influence in those Aramaic texts (including some vocabulary, and the use of four dots to represent the Hebrew divine name at 4Q196 17 i 5 [12.22] and 18.15 [14.2]) points no more clearly in the direction of Hebrew. Likewise, more general considerations do not help. The setting of the story in Nineveh and Rages in the East might suggest Aramaic, the *lingua franca* of that area during the Second Temple period, as the language naturally suited for such a story. On the other hand, the sparseness of concrete evidence for Aramaic texts being translated into Hebrew would favour Hebrew. Recent scholarship has tended slightly to favour Aramaic, but, barring the recovery of further evidence, debates on this can be expected for some time to come.

The Greek translation was not necessarily made from a source-text in the original language of composition, but matters are no more clear-cut here, and much discussion has been devoted to identifying features which might point specifically to Hebrew or Aramaic. This discussion has faced the general problem that we might expect to find both Aramaic influence on Hebrew of this period, and Hebraic, biblicalising features in an Aramaic composition of this sort. There has been little agreement,

furthermore, over attempts to identify specific words or phrases as renderings necessarily of either Hebrew or Aramaic originals. The matter is sometimes complicated by difficulties in establishing the original reading of the Greek. The much-discussed relationship between GII πορεύθητι καὶ ἀγαλλίασαι ‘go and rejoice’ and 4Q200 ידוּחַי וְשׂוֹשׁ, for instance, seems rather irrelevant when the original reading of the Greek is more probably attested by GI χάρητι καὶ ἀγαλλίασαι ‘delight and rejoice’ and OL *gaude et laetare*. Again, the argument has not been sufficiently compelling on either side to generate a consensus, and the language of the Greek translator’s source-text remains uncertain.

This has consequences, of course, for our evaluation of the translation’s character, and the problem is compounded by the fact that we have neither any complete text preserved among the Qumran fragments, nor, indeed, any guarantee that the source text corresponded perfectly, at any given point, to the readings which we do possess. In 3.15, for instance, 4Q196 has ‘in all the land of our captivity’, but all the Greek and Latin witnesses have ‘in the land of my captivity’, suggesting that the source text from which they are ultimately derived may have been different. The many errors in our witnesses to GII, and the extensive revisions in GI and GIII also make it difficult to undertake a detailed analysis of translation technique and style in the original translation. However, it is possible to state in general terms that the translation seems to have been an admixture of the literal and the idiomatic, tending strongly toward the former, which is neither exceptional in character, nor particularly close to any other specific Septuagint translation.

II. Time and Place of Composition

The date of the translation is uncertain. Tobit is not certainly cited before the early second century C.E. (when Polycarp’s *Epistle to the Philippians* quotes 4.10/12.9), and the earliest manuscript evidence for the Greek is from the third. It is dangerous to place too much weight on orthographic or morphological evidence, especially given the many revisions and errors visible in the tradition, but it is noteworthy that MS 319 attests the forms *μηθενί* and *μεθέν* (= *μηθέν*) at 4.15, which may well be original and probably gave rise to the unexpected sayings about alcohol (*μέθη*) in the GI and OL versions. Sinaiticus lacks the section, but attests *μηθέν* at

14.04 and οὐθέν at 12.19. The forms with *theta* in other books were strongly linked to an early date of translation by Thackeray (*Grammar*, pp. 58–62), and are increasingly rare in documentary sources after the second century B.C.E. There is nothing to preclude an early translation, and it should be borne in mind, therefore, that the Qumran witnesses to the Hebrew and Aramaic may post-date the earliest version of the Greek. There is no specific evidence for the place of translation, although it is noteworthy that the vocalisation of the Northern Kingdom place-names Kedesh and Hazor as Κυδιώς and Ἀσσήρ in 1.2 is odd, and betrays no familiarity with that region, so Egypt is probably the strongest candidate.

III. Language

It is not possible to recreate the original translation in every detail. It is clear, though, that the translator had a good knowledge of Greek, and sometimes used unusual or technical vocabulary to represent terms in his source. So, for example, we may note the use of κατ'ἀλήθειαν 'after the nature' in 4.12 (GII *ad* MS 319), which is comparable to the usage in Diod. Sic. 4.64.2, of Oedipus enquiring after his birth-parents, or the similar technical usage of ἔγγιστα 'next of kin' in GII 6.12. In 4.20 (παρεθέμην 'deposited') and 5.3 (χειρόγραφον 'bond'), we find appropriate financial vocabulary, while proper medical terms (such as λευκώματα 'white spots') are used throughout where needed to characterise Tobit's blindness and cure. The nature of the translation is such that the style and word order often feel more Semitic than Greek (see below), but actual 'Semitisms' are uncommon. Accordingly, when we find Greek constructions which were probably selected to match Hebrew/Aramaic constructions in the source text—such as the periphrastic future in GII/GIII 9.4 (where 4Q197 apparently had a clause with הוהל + participle), or the partitive use of ἐκ in 7.9—the Greek usage may be somewhat unnatural, but the text is not a simple calque.

IV. Translation and Composition

On occasion, it seems likely that the translator paraphrased, or rendered according to sense. In 6.8, for instance, GII οὐ μὴ μείνωσιν distils the meaning of the expression found in 4Q197 'they will [not] go round their

surroundings' (that is, 'they will not hang around them'), and similarly in 3.14, if his source text read literally 'I am clean in my bones' as 4Q196, the translator has omitted the reference to bones. In various places (such as 7.1), the original has apparently been modified to give more Greek forms of greeting. As a general rule, though, the translation seems to have stayed close to the wording and order of its source. The various senses of the ι conjunctive, for example, are only sometimes differentiated, and it is usually rendered with $\kappa\alpha\iota$. Indeed, $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ is correspondingly rather unusual in the earliest readings: in GII it appears only at 1.11, 22; 5.2, 4; 7.10; 10.1; and 12.7, and the other versions point to it being a secondary revision in 5.4; 7.10; and 10.1. While it probably is original in 1.22 and 12.7, it corresponds to 4Q196 ארִי in the former, and no Qumran text survives for the latter. Where ι has a consecutive sense, it may or may not be rendered by $\tau\acute{o}\tau\epsilon$ or similar, although the original reading of the Greek is not always easy to establish (as at, e.g., the start of 1.22). The general consequence, of course, is that the narrative has a strongly Semitic feel. Elsewhere, we find resumptive personal pronouns reproduced awkwardly in the Greek (GII 6.9), non-verbal sentences (GII 6.12), and other features which are not necessarily improper Greek, but which often seem awkward. Many of the revisions in GI and GIII seem to improve the Greek at such points, and it seems possible that those revisions were motivated, at least in part, by a desire for greater clarity and fluency. It would be reasonable to suggest, then, both that the translator was much more concerned to offer a translation that was accurate and faithful than to produce a work which was lucid, stylish, or literary, and that some subsequent readers found the result unsatisfactory.

V. Key Text-Critical Issues

The general situation has been outlined above, and is reasonably clear. It is more difficult to establish, however, just how that situation arose. The relatively consistent witness of the manuscripts in the GI tradition, along with the paucity of manuscripts for GII and GIII, gives an impression of three readily separable versions. It is important to observe, however, that a papyrus fragment from the late third century C.E. (POxy. 1594 = Cambridge add. 6363) preserves readings in 12.14-19 which correspond

at times to the distinctive readings of all three main versions (and sometimes to none). Another, much later papyrus (POxy. 1076 = John Rylands Gk.P. 448; ca. sixth century) has material from 2.2-5, 8 which frequently differs from GI and GII, and its identification as a fragment of GIII is largely speculative, since that version is not preserved elsewhere for this part of the book. Even the early third-century fragment published recently by Manfredi, which clearly belongs to the GII tradition, has some readings which are unexpected and unique. To whatever extent such variety gave rise to the different versions, or else resulted from their existence and interaction, it seems apparent that the textual situation was once even more complicated than it is now, and perhaps considerably more fluid. Nicklas and Wagner ('Thesen') have accordingly, and with some justice, questioned the value of any simplistic division into separate versions, and of prioritising GII as 'original'. Weeks ('Restoring') has suggested, on the other hand, that correspondences of GI and GIII to the readings of the papyrus fragments and the Old Latin show only that the revisors often took up existing variants from the unrevised tradition, which are sometimes probably more original than the readings found in Sinaiticus; correspondingly, we should neither presume the originality of the unrevised texts, nor automatically exclude the readings of the revised texts as secondary.

VI. Ideology and Exegesis

See the discussions under the individual recensions.

VII. Reception History

The sustained popularity of the book of Tobit in medieval Jewish and Christian circles is attested through at least seven different versions that circulated of it in Aramaic (Oxford Bodleian Hebrew MS no. 2339, fourteenth century) and Hebrew (Cairo Genizah MS no. T-S A45.26 from Cambridge, thirteenth century; Constantinople 1516; Constantinople 1519; North French Miscellany from British Library in London, thirteenth century; notations of a now lost manuscript by Moses Gaster, nineteenth century; and the *'Otsar Haqqodesh* published in Lemberg in 1851).

These versions have not convinced scholars of their text-critical value. However, they remain significant for three primary reasons. First, they reflect the ongoing influence and import of the earlier versions of Tobit, although, because of textual fluidity between the recensions, it is not always possible to be precise about the texts from which they derive. Second, they represent retellings of the storyline which not infrequently reflect the much later Jewish settings in which the story was being told. Third, and related to the previous point, the medieval Jewish texts, insofar as they reflect influence from versions that circulated in Christian circles, may illustrate a process of reclaiming the book of Tobit. In addition, portions of Tobit made an impact on other literature, such as on the Christian *Testament of Solomon* from the third century C.E. In this case, it is the GII recension that more likely underlies the *Testament*. For, the demon Asmodeus's association with Assyria (*T. Sol.* 6.10) might reflect the greater prominence of Assyria in GII than in GI (Tob. 1.10, 22; 14.4), and the mention of the fish's liver and gall together (*T. Sol.* 5.9, 13) might reflect the tendency in GII, unlike GI, to regard both of these, together with the heart, as 'medicine' (see below). The book of Tobit, especially its prayers, also wielded an influence on liturgical texts in Latin (a Mozarabic Breviary, attested in the eleventh century and Gothic Breviary with a liturgy going back to St Isidore both take up the song about Jerusalem from Tobit ch. 13). Finally, a loose retelling of the story also appears in the collection of tales called *Book of Delights*, written by the Barcelona physician Joseph Zabara in the twelfth century.

In art, the most well-known paintings taken from scenes in the book were produced by the Italian painters Fra Filippo Lippi (1406–1469) and Raphael (1483–1520) and the Dutch painter Rembrandt (1606–1669). From these painters the most famous works related to the book present the following scenes: Tobit with his wife Anna and her goat (Raphael, ch. 2), Tobias being accompanied by the three archangels (Filippo Lippi, who added the angels Michael and Gabriel to the story of Tobias's journey in ch. 6, with the heavenly Jerusalem, underneath a cross, in the distant background), the healing of Tobit's blindness (Rembrandt, ch. 11), and the ascension of Raphael (Raphael and Rembrandt, ch. 12). Nothing in these paintings can at present be traced to details found specially in any one or other of the Greek recensions, though the Christianisation of the story by Filippo Lippi more likely relates to the

Vulgate which contains such traces. Many other artists have since taken up these and other themes from the book. A series of paintings in the Church of the Angel Raphael (fourteenth century) in Venice inspired British author, Sally Vickers, to publish a novel that weaves the narrative of the book with the life of an elderly woman, entitled *Miss Garnet's Angel* (2002). This novel clearly draws on and follows the text of GI.

B. The Long Version of Tobit (GII)

I. General Characteristics

The original version of Tobit in Greek was largely replaced by the GI version and, to a lesser extent, the GIII version. Both of these were based on texts derived from the initial translation and preserve readings from that translation. Such texts are now almost extinct: only Codex Sinaiticus and MS 319 (in 3.6–6.16) preserve texts unaffected by the GI and GIII changes, although they each also embody other alterations to the original, caused by scribal error or deliberate emendation. If Greek witnesses are rare, however, we do have a plethora of Old Latin manuscripts, which present considerable text-critical problems themselves, but which largely reflect a source text also derived ultimately from the initial translation. To the extent that we can recreate that source text, we have, therefore, a third witness to the original tradition. The ‘Long Version’ of Tobit is a term used, often rather loosely, to characterise these separate witnesses, but some caution and qualification is needed. In the first place, the Greek texts differ from each other and from the Old Latin: although they share an ancestor in the original translation, all probably derive from separate strands in the subsequent transmission of that text, and they do not together represent a particular redaction or recension of the text, as do GI and GIII. We cannot, therefore, set GII in parallel with those others, as if it were the same sort of ‘version’. Indeed, if we equate it simply with the original form of the Greek—and it is not uncommon for the translation and even the Qumran manuscripts loosely to be called ‘Long’ texts—then GI and GIII are simply sub-recensions within GII. For our present purposes, we use the term more specifically with reference to Sinaiticus, MS 319, and the Old Latin texts, and focus on the distinctive characteristics of each.

a. Sinaiticus

For Sinaiticus, the most important of these is probably its defectiveness. The text omits a substantial amount of material, almost certainly as a result of scribal error in most cases. The lengthiest omissions are in 4.7-19 and 13.6-10, but comparison with the other versions suggests some shorter losses too: at the start of the list in 3.12, for instance, the scribe's eye has apparently skipped from one πάντες οἱ 'all those' to another, later occurrence: 'Cursed are all those who <reject you, and all who blaspheme you; cursed are all who hate you and all who> speak'. A few verses earlier, in 13.5, καὶ συνάχει ὑμας has probably been lost before ἐκ, creating a very confusing sentence. Not all the errors are of omission, however, and so in 11.4, for example, τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτῆς 'her son' has apparently been replicated from the end of the next verse (with καὶ then added to facilitate the reading), while in the same verse κύων 'dog' has famously and funnily been read as the abbreviation κ(υρι)ος, so that 'the Lord' now follows, instead of 'the dog'. Such errors (and there are many more) are probably not attributable to scribe D of Sinaiticus, who is elsewhere very able, and there are signs that the text had already been altered to overcome the most obvious problems arising from them. Thus in 4.19 Sinaiticus resumes from the lacuna with δώσει κύριος αὐτοῖς βουλὴν ἀγαθὴν 'the Lord will give to them good counsel', an apparent adaptation to (the now immediately preceding) οἱ ποιῶντες ἀλήθειαν 'those who act truthfully' of 4.6; cf. 319 βουλὴν ἀγαθὴν ἀλλ' αὐτὸς ὁ κύριος δίδωσιν. Similarly, in 11.14, ἐφ' ἡμᾶς 'upon us' may have been introduced to make sense of the preceding γένοιτο ὄνομα τὸ μέγα αὐτοῦ 'may his great name' (itself perhaps a corruption), after the blessing of the angels had been accidentally repeated. Sinaiticus has inherited, then, a form of the text which was badly mauled at some earlier stage, and has been further changed in places as a consequence.

Not all of the apparent alterations in the text are attributable to this process, however. We have already noted above that καὶ was apparently replaced by δέ in 5.4; 7.10 and 10.1, and this is certainly a stylistic change. From among a number of further instances, we might note also the adoption of the comparative χρησιμώτερον 'more useful' in 3.10, and the corresponding change of construction which shifts the negation to the subsequent clause; this, too, is almost certainly secondary, and intended

to improve the style rather than to alter the sense. Some other changes to content seem motivated by different considerations. In 1.1, for instance, the characters Raphael and Ragouel mysteriously find their way into Tobit's list of ancestors, while in 5.5 'he answered him and' has probably been deleted as redundant. In the next verse, *καὶ πολλάκις ἐγὼ ἐγενόμην ἐκεῖ* 'yes, I was often there' seems to be an attempt to make sense of an over-literal *πολλὰ ἐγὼ ἐπίσταμαι* 'I know many things' in the original (cf. 319, OL), while the whole of 4.6 seems to have been switched from a second-person address to an indicative, third-person generalisation. It is not always possible to be sure whether the reading of Sinaiticus is original or secondary, but there are many other places in which it appears that the text has been changed for reasons of style, clarity, or the incorporation of specific understandings. If Sinaiticus does not reflect the sort of substantial re-writing which characterises GI and GIII, it is at least very far from identical to the original Greek translation.

b. MS 319

MS 319 is, of course, defective in a different way, with its 'Long' text extending as it does only from 3.6–6.16. In general, this text lies closer to the Old Latin than does that of Sinaiticus. Where they agree, and where precedence can be deduced from other witnesses or from considerations of style and content, they generally preserve a more original text. So, for instance, in 6.12 GIII and the Old Latin both support 319 *ἀγαπᾷ αὐτήν* 'he loves her' against Sinaiticus *καλός* 'fair', and their reading corresponds, furthermore, to that of 4Q197; indeed, it seems likely that the lengthy plus in 319 and the Latin there is also original. Such agreement, accordingly, may be more a matter of deviation from the original in Sinaiticus than of a particular affinity between 319 and the source text of the Latin. There are, indeed, points at which it seems to agree with Sinaiticus against that source text: in 6.6, for instance, the majority Old Latin reading *coeperunt iter agere* 'they set out on a journey' seems to suggest a source closer to GI *ἴδενον ἀμφότεροι* than to the *ἐπορεύθησαν* of 319 and Sinaiticus. In general, MS 319 should probably be regarded as a more reliable witness to the original Greek translation than is Sinaiticus, but it is not without alterations of its own. In 5.4, for example, where Sinaiticus has apparently changed *καί* to *δέ*, 319 has *τότε*, and

there are a number of minor errors. Despite the preservation of the ‘Long’ material in a manuscript which otherwise offers a GI text, there is no evidence of systematic revision towards that tradition, and where 319 agrees with GI against Sinaiticus, they often present a discernibly better reading. In 4.5, for instance, both have the singular *δικαιοσύνην* ‘righteousness’, against the plural of Sinaiticus, and this is supported by OL and the reading of 4Q200. Correspondingly, where Sinaiticus and GI agree against 319, they may highlight errors in 319—as at the end of that same verse, where 319 wrongly has the plural *ταῖς ἀδικίαις* ‘the offences’.

c. The Old Latin

The pre-Vulgate Latin translations have sometimes been lost almost entirely for other Septuagint works, and are rarely crucial for the reconstruction of the Greek text. For Tobit, the case is very different. Auwers, who is preparing the Beuron edition, lists 16 manuscripts, of which 12 preserve the text in its entirety. In addition to these, there is a fairly substantial body of indirect evidence for certain passages, where the text has been cited or used for liturgical purposes. Furthermore, when Sinaiticus is defective outside the section where we have a Long text in MS 319, the Old Latin provides the only witness to the original translation, generally unaffected by the GI/GIII revisions. More generally, indeed, it often seems to provide a better reading than Sinaiticus, and the Old Latin is, therefore, unusually important for Tobit. This has long been recognised, and it was the Old Latin, after all, which first alerted scholars to the existence of Tobit in a form other than the Short text, before Sinaiticus was even known. It raises, however, many text-critical problems of its own.

The text adopted by Sabatier in his eighteenth-century edition of the Old Latin was based on the ninth-century French Codex Regius 3564 (number 148 in the Beuron scheme, MS Q in Hanhart’s edition of the Greek). This is a fair representative of what might be considered the majority Old Latin text (and Gathercole, ‘Tobit in Spain’, has argued for its priority over and against other related texts), but there is considerable variety within that textual tradition, and two other, very different text-types are known. The first is preserved in the slightly later Spanish

Alcalà Bible (Beuron 109; Hanhart MS X), and is apparently a revision of something like the Regius text. That revision extends beyond Tobit, however, draws on other sources, possibly including Greek texts, and paraphrases so extensively that it is difficult to use for text-critical purposes. It seems, though, to have enjoyed a certain popularity and to have influenced readings elsewhere in the Old Latin tradition. The other is preserved only for 1.1–6.12, and only in one manuscript, Codex Reginensis 7 (Beuron 143; Hanhart MS W), which is another ninth-century French product. This differs so very considerably from other Old Latin texts that it may reasonably be supposed to reflect a separate translation, or at least a very intensive revision which drew heavily on Greek sources. In a number of places it supports Sinaiticus against other Old Latin manuscripts, even where they almost certainly have a more original reading (as, for instance, in 3.11, where Sinaiticus and Reginensis alone lack the qualification ‘holy and honourable’ for God’s name, which finds a corresponding reading in 4Q196). It does not do this consistently by any means, but its affinities suggest that it may have been based on a Greek text rather different from the source-text of the majority Old Latin, and it has a great deal in common with the GIII text where the two briefly overlap.

Because it is difficult to say much about the precise character of the sources used, it is also difficult, of course, to assess the nature of the translations. The Latin translators do seem to have adhered fairly closely to the Greek, sometimes adapting to Latin usage or introducing minor facilitations, and more rarely paraphrasing, but generally offering quite a reliable witness to their source text. Their successors, however, often seem to have revised and adapted with considerable freedom, so that the manuscripts themselves vary wildly in content. With much of the material still unpublished, or published inadequately, it is not currently possible to disentangle the complicated relationships between the different Old Latin texts, or to do the comparative work necessary for recreation of the original in many places. Important though they are, then, the Old Latin texts have to be used with much caution for text-critical purposes, and it is unfortunate that Sabatier’s text is often presented simplistically as ‘the Old Latin’, with little appreciation of the underlying problems.

II. Time and Place of Composition

Inasmuch as they transmit readings from the original translation, the 'Long' Greek texts have no particular date or location of their own. The date(s) at which the Old Latin originated cannot be determined with any precision, but a text close to the Regius form used by Sabatier was being cited by Cyprian of Carthage in the middle of the third century, while the Alcalá revision was composed no later than the last quarter of the fourth century, and sections of Tobit from it were cited in the Mediterranean region at the beginning of the fifth. These dates supply *termini ad quem*, and the original translation may have been considerably earlier.

III. Key Text-Critical Issues

The discovery of the Tobit manuscripts at Qumran has affirmed the basic priority of the Long Greek tradition, and equivalents to their readings are usually to be found in one or more of the witnesses to that tradition. Reconstruction of the original Greek translation from these sources, however, is far from straightforward in many places. To begin with, there are minor inconsistencies between the Qumran texts where they overlap, and there are also places where Qumran readings correspond to none of the witnesses; in 3.15, for example, we have no equivalent to 4Q196 'in *all* the land'. It cannot be assumed, therefore, that the original Greek translation was based on a text identical to any which we possess, and the Qumran texts cannot properly, therefore, be used to supply or emend the Greek: they are not themselves witnesses to that translation. Of course, where a Qumran reading corresponds to one found in our actual witnesses, the improbability of coincidence lends some presumption of originality to that reading—but that is a rather different matter.

A greater problem arises from our current inability to describe the relationships between the witnesses. Text criticism is not a democratic process: errors may spread far afield, and original readings die out altogether. It is important, therefore, to understand the ways in which witnesses relate to each other and may have inherited readings from each other, but for Tobit such study is still in its infancy. Despite a certain amount of pessimism in some quarters, there is much that can be done

here with the evidence already available, and current work on the Old Latin, in particular, promises to furnish better evidence. One aspect of this study, sometimes rather overlooked, is the place of the GI and GIII traditions, which frequently agree with other witnesses against Sinaiticus, and which have a place in the Long tradition family-tree. Too much scholarship on the book still works with an outmoded dichotomy between Long and Short versions, and hands to Sinaiticus an outright victory in the matter of priority, when the situation is actually much more complicated (see Weeks, 'Restoring').

IV. Ideology and Exegesis

See GI below, § V, Ideology and Exegesis.

C. The Short Version of Tobit (GI)

I. General Characteristics

Although it dominates the textual tradition, the Short version of Tobit can no longer be regarded as the basis of the Long, and Deselaers has won little support for his convoluted theory that the Qumran texts are themselves expansions of a lost Short text. The debate over priority goes back many years, and, a quarter of a century ago, Hanhart was still cautious about the question in his edition, but it is now generally accepted that this most common form of Tobit is a re-working of the original translation, which tends to be more concise than the Long texts, and which frequently reads rather more smoothly. Not only is this solution more economical in text-critical terms, but it also avoids the need to explain why GII should have introduced so much material which is apparently redundant.

The distinctiveness of GI should not be exaggerated, however: at the level of individual clauses, and sometimes for quite long passages, the tradition frequently presents a text which is all but indistinguishable from that of Sinaiticus, or differs only in minor ways. Where they do differ substantially, moreover, comparison with the other Long witnesses or the Qumran fragments suggests that it is sometimes Sinaiticus, and not GI, which has imposed changes on the original. As well as offering a version

which is of interest in its own right, therefore, GI presents a potentially useful witness to the original translation and to the early development of the textual tradition—even if the extent to which it has been revised in some places mostly limits this usefulness to providing corroboration.

Many of the revisions in GI can be classed as stylistic or clarificatory: they do not change the essential content and meaning of the text. Words are frequently replaced with near synonyms, so that 8.4 uses *συνκλείω* ‘to enclose’, for example, rather than *ἀποκλείω*, and 13.13 *συνάγω* ‘to gather’ for *ἐπισυνάγω*, while *δέ*, so rare in GII, is a commonplace of GI. Sentences are sometimes re-written for clarity (e.g., the first sentence of 6.16) or conciseness (e.g., 7.12). Where the alterations are more substantial, they often involve a reduction in detail, and this is especially evident in the presentation of speeches: the characters in GII are usually much less wordy. So in 6.10-13, for example, Raphael manages to put across the essential facts a great deal more succinctly than he does in the Long version, while Tobit’s lengthy grumble vanishes altogether from 5.10. Inessential details may be removed as well, so that in 9.5-6, for instance, GII does not recount that Raphael took four servants and two camels with him to visit Gabael, that he told Gabael about the wedding, or that they returned to find Tobias at table; Gabael’s enthusiastic speech is then turned into a mere note that he blessed the couple. All this arguably makes the narrative crisper, but the characters more anodyne. It is interesting to observe that such drastic changes do not seem to have been made in the very didactic or theological speeches of 4.5-19 and 12.6-15, or the prayers of 8.5-7, 15-17; 11.14-15 (where Sinaiticus has probably expanded the original), while Tobit’s prayer in ch. 13 has only been trimmed, so far as we can tell, at a few particular points. It would seem that GI has rather more interest in this material than in the elaborate details of the storytelling.

II. Time and Place of Composition

The origins of the GI tradition are unknown, but it already dominates the early manuscript tradition in the fourth century, and seems to be represented in the papyrus fragment which Manfredi published, and dated to the mid-third century. There is no specific reason to suppose that it emerged in Christian rather than Jewish circles, and it could be earlier.

Its wide circulation, at least in the East, is indicated by its use as a source-text for the Coptic and Armenian daughter versions, and for most of the Syriac (see on GIII, below).

III. Translation and Composition

The revised text preserves many of the features of the original translation, but tends to read more smoothly and consistently. To take a fairly typical example, 1.16 begins by eliminating the initial *καί* then replaces *ἐποίησα* with *ἐποίουν*, which makes better sense in context and is consistent with the imperfects of the next verse. A few verses later, in 1.19, Sinaiticus reads *καὶ ἐπορεύθη εἰς τις τῶν ἐκ τῆς Νινευῆ καὶ ὑπέδειξεν* ‘and one of those from Nineveh came and showed’, which probably reflects the source text closely (judging by 4Q196); in GI this becomes the much less clumsy *πορευθεὶς δὲ εἰς τῶν ἐν Νινευῆ ὑπέδειξεν*. The effect of such changes across the book is to create a version of Tobit which usually reads more fluently as Greek, and in which there is less one-to-one correspondence with the Semitic source text of the original translation.

IV. Key Text-Critical Issues

The consistency of approach suggests that GI arose as the result of a specific editing of the text. It is important to be aware, however, both that it may have inherited some alterations to the original translation from its own source text, and that further changes may have become incorporated into the tradition after it first emerged. Even where we can identify the probable reading of the original translation, therefore, not every difference or correspondence can be laid at the door of GI’s creator. The situation would be complicated considerably more were there persuasive evidence for any extensive interaction between the GI and GII traditions, but the two seem rarely to have co-existed, at least in Greek (GI readings are found in some Old Latin, apparently introduced as the result of revisions toward the Greek). It is interesting to note in 3.8, therefore, that the same pair of variants occurs in both GI and GII: *ὠνάσθης* (GII: MS 319, and reflected in the Old Latin; GI: Vaticanus and Alexandrinus, reflected in the daughter versions) and *ὠνομάσθης* (GII: Sinaiticus; GI:

almost all other MSS). Some influence from one tradition to the other cannot be excluded here, although it may be easier to explain the more ‘respectable’ ὠνομάσθης as an independent, secondary development in each. By and large, though, we can treat GI and GII as distinct, which makes GI a useful corroborative witness to the original translation.

V. Ideology and Exegesis (GI and GII)

The numerous differences between the recensions of GI and GII have been listed by Hahnhart (*Text und Textgeschichte*, pp. 23–34). Most of these are of interest from text-critical and stylistic points of view, and a few examples of this have been mentioned above. One should therefore be cautious, without first considering style and textual variants, in assigning differences between the recensions to distinguishable ideologies. At the same time, a comparison between the versions does have the potential to yield insight into religious attitudes held or accentuated in the texts. Several examples of this illustrate the point.

First, unlike GII the GI recension appears to have deliberately avoided the term φάρμακον as a designation for the fish’s parts which, when applied in accordance with the angel’s instructions, contribute to protection from the demon Asmodeus just before Tobias and Sara consummate their marriage and to the healing of Tobit’s blindness. This difference illustrates how a much contested term (cf. the Greek to 2 Kgs 9.22; Jer. 34.9; Dan. 2.27; Mic. 5.11; Nah. 3.4; *I En.* 8.3; but cf. Sir. 38.1-15) could play a role in or even be subject to censure in the revision and transmission of the book (Stuckenbruck, ‘Book of Tobit’). Second, in 3.6 both GI and GII relate Sara’s decision not to commit suicide to her father’s happiness. However, whereas GII stresses Sara’s need to consider her father’s public reputation (i.e., what people will say, ὀνειδιῶσιν) more than any moral implications of what she contemplates, GI considers the suicide shameful (ὄνειδος) in itself. Third, the place of Gentiles at the end of the book differs in GI and GII. At 14.4, GII has Tobit exhort his son to flee from Nineveh to Media because he believes the prophecy about Nineveh’s destruction in Nahum (cf. 14.15). In GI, however, the warrant to flee Nineveh is found not in Nahum, but in a reference instead to Jonah. Since the story of Jonah, in contrast to the attitude of Nahum, results in the repentance of Nineveh, the reference to Jonah accords well

with the text's anticipation in the following verses (14.6-7) that Gentiles will participate in the eschatological worship of God by Israel (though the tension with 14.15 remains; Bredin, 'Significance'). Fourth, it is possible that the original association of the verb λύω in 3.17 (MS 319, Sinaiticus) with a loosing or divorce of the demon Asmodeus from Sara (whom he loved, 6.15 MS 319 and GI) has been altered in GI to the more conventional verb 'to bind' (δέω) in line with Raphael's activity against the demon in 8.3. In a putative original (represented best in MS 319), Asmodeus's love for Sara is given marital overtones, and Raphael's act of 'binding' in 8.3 functions to ensure that the 'loosed' demon will not return. Sinaiticus retains the 'loosing', though this text no longer mentions Asmodeus's affection, thus losing the possible connotation of λύω within the larger narrative. While MS 319 regards the 'loosing' and 'binding' in 3.17 and 8.3, respectively, as different activities, the use of δέω in GI in both passages has the effect of losing the association between Raphael's activity against the demon and the demon's disposition towards Sara (Ego, 'Textual Variants').

D. The Third Version of Tobit (GIII)

I. General Characteristics

A small group of rather late Greek manuscripts (Hanhart's group *d*) preserves for the first few chapters of Tobit a text which is distinctive, but certainly belongs to the GI tradition. They then, however, present a very different text between about 6.8 and 13.2 (it is difficult to identify the precise beginning and end). The same text seems to underlie most manuscripts of the Syriac after about 7.11, and is clearly a different version of Tobit. In 6.8-12, where the two overlap, this version is very similar to the Old Latin text on Reginensis 7 (see above, GII § I.c), and it is likely that the two are related in some way. If it is a reasonable assumption that this version of Tobit originally encompassed the whole book, then this Latin text may be the sole witness to the first part, although the Oxyrhynchus papyrus 1076, discussed above, is sometimes linked to the Third Greek—principally on the basis that it does not obviously belong to GI or GII.

GIII has often been characterised as a ‘mediating’ version, which draws on both the other two versions. Close examination suggests, however, that it is better understood as a separate re-working of the Greek translation, similar in nature to GI, but not dependent upon it (Weeks, ‘Neglected Texts’). Where the two agree against Sinaiticus, there is almost always a corresponding reading elsewhere among the witnesses to the Long Version, and where GIII is clearly altering its source it rarely resembles GI. Indeed, there is little reason to believe that GIII shows any awareness at all of GI. It nevertheless operates in a similar way, re-writing and usually shortening its source text. 7.14 provides a brief but typical illustration. Here Sinaiticus is probably identical to the original translation, and reads ἀπ’ ἐκείνου ἤρξαντο φαγεῖν καὶ πεῖν (= πιεῖν) ‘from then they began to eat and drink’: GI shortens this to καὶ ἤρξαντο ἐσθίειν ‘and they began to eat’; GIII quite differently to καὶ τότε ἔφαγον καὶ ἔπιον ‘and then they ate and drank’. Arguably, though, GIII is prepared to go rather further than GI in many cases, often quite substantially re-casting and re-phrasing the text. In 8.9-10, 18, for example, Raguel’s precautionary preparation of a grave for Tobias is narrated quite differently, with servants sent to dig, and then to fill it immediately upon their return, and Raguel’s motives given a somewhat sinister edge. In 11.3-6, similarly, the dog is given a much better role, running in front of Tobias so that it is the first thing Anna sees of her son’s return, and she has time to fetch Tobit. While remaining reasonably faithful to its source, GIII tells a better story than either GI or GII, and it is hard to believe that this was not an intention of its creator. Such changes are reflected even in minor details—Anna stands to stare straight down the street in 11.05 (εἰστήκει ἐπιβλέπουσα), rather than sitting and looking around (ἐκάθητο περιβλεπομένη), as in the other versions. In 7.08, Edna and Sarah weep piously for Tobit in GI and GII, but according to GIII, Edna kisses Tobias, and so does Sarah—furnishing a motive for Tobias to ask Raphael, in the next verse, that he arrange for him to marry her, despite his previous reservations (and an added δὲ lends emphasis to the request!).

II. Time and Place of Composition

The principal manuscripts (Biblioteca Comunale, Ferrara, 187 I and 188 I, MSS 106 and 107 in the Göttingen scheme) are from the fourteenth century, and although the version is certainly much earlier, it is difficult to assign a date. A link with the Old Latin Reginensis text would take it back to the ninth century, but we cannot go further with certainty. Harris long ago suggested that GIII 12.8-9a was reflected in 2 *Clement*, written around the middle of the second century, but this is uncertain, and the specific formulation there might equally have been influenced by Sir. 40.24. There is no evidence for location.

III. Translation and Composition

Minor changes of word order and expression suggest that GIII is seeking to improve the fluency of its text, and different words are sometimes substituted. The resulting text is certainly more lucid and readable, but the style is not notably more literary than that of the original translation, and is less ambitious than that of GI.

IV. Key Text-Critical Issues

The fact that it revises the text so extensively does not prevent GIII being a useful corroborative witness to the original translation, and it sometimes offers the best Greek reading. Matters are made a little difficult, however, by the absence of a proper critical edition: readings from the relevant manuscripts are offered only in the apparatus of the major editions, and not always exhaustively, while only MS 106 is presented fully in the synoptic editions. Little work has been done on the relationship with the Syriac texts, moreover, and GIII is altogether a little neglected. It needs to be used with some caution, therefore, until such groundwork has been done.

V. Ideology and Exegesis

It is difficult to identify any specific ideological interest, although GIII notably represents Asmodeus as an ‘evil spirit’ rather than a demon. That may reflect the ideas of its cultural context, but may also be just a biblicising feature.

Bibliography

- Auwers, J.-M., ‘La tradition vieille latine du livre de Tobie. Un état de la question’, in G.G. Xeravits and J. Zsengellér (eds.), *The Book of Tobit: Text, Tradition, Theology. Papers of the First International Conference on the Deuteronomical Books, Pápa, Hungary, 20–21 May, 2004* (JSJSup 98; Leiden: Brill, 2005), pp. 1–21.
- Bredin, M., ‘The Significance of Jonah in Vaticanus (B) Tobit 14.4 and 8’, in M. Bredin (ed.), *Studies in the Book of Tobit: A Multidisciplinary Approach* (Library of Second Temple Studies 55; London: T&T Clark International, 2006), pp. 43–58.
- Cook, E.M., ‘Our Translated Tobit’, in K.J. Cathcart and M. Maher (eds.), *Targumic and Cognate Studies: Essays in Honour of Martin McNamara* (JSOTSup 230; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), pp. 153–62.
- Deselaers, P., *Das Buch Tobit. Studien zu seiner Entstehung, Komposition und Theologie* (OBO 43; Freiburg: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982).
- Ego, B., ‘Textual Variants as the Result of Enculturation: The Banishment of the Demon in Tobit’, in W. Kraus and R.G. Wooden (eds.), *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of Greek Jewish Scriptures* (SBLSCS 53; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), pp. 371–78.
- Elgvin, T., and M. Hallermayer, ‘Schøyen Ms. 5234: Ein neues Tobit-Fragment vom Toten Meer’, *RevQ* 22 (2006), pp. 451–60.
- Fitzmyer, J.A., ‘Tobit’, in M. Broshi *et al.* (eds.), *Qumran Cave 4 XIV: Parabiblical Texts, Part 2* (DJD 19; Oxford: Clarendon, 1995), pp. 1–76, pls. I–X.
- Gathercole, S., ‘Tobit in Spain: Some Preliminary Comments on the Relationships between the Old Latin Witnesses’, in M. Bredin (ed.), *Studies in the Book of Tobit: A Multidisciplinary Approach* (Library of Second Temple Studies 55; London: T&T Clark International, 2006), pp. 5–11.
- Hallermayer, M., *Text und Überlieferung des Buches Tobit* (DCLS 3; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008).
- Hanhart, R., *Text und Textgeschichte des Buches Tobit* (MSU 17; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984).
- Hanhart, R. (ed.), *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum*. Vol. VIII.5, *Tobit* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983).
- Harris, J.R., ‘The Double Text of Tobit’, *AJT* 3 (1899), pp. 541–49.

The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint

- Littmann, R.J., *Tobit: The Book of Tobit in Codex Sinaiticus* (Septuagint Commentary Series; Leiden: Brill, 2008).
- Manfredi, M., ‘Un Frammento del Libro di Tobit. LXX, Tobias, 12,6-7, 8-11’, in *Paideia Cristiana* (Festschrift M. Naldini; Scritti in Onore 2; Rome: Gruppo Editoriale Internazionale, 1994), pp. 175–81.
- Nicklas, T., and C.J. Wagner, ‘Thesen zur Textlichen Vielfalt im Tobitbuch’, *JSJ* 34 (2003), pp. 141–59.
- Sabatier, P., *Bibliorum Sacrorum Latinae versiones Antiquae, seu Vetus Italica, et Caeterae quaecunque in Codicibus Mss. & antiquorum libris reperiri potuerunt: Quae cum Vulgata Latina, & cum Textu Graeco comparantur: Accedunt Praefationes, Observationes, ac Notae, Indexque novus ad VULGATAM è regione editam, idemque locupletissimus*, vol. I (Paris: F. Didot, re-issue 1751).
- Stuckenbruck, L., ‘The Book of Tobit and the Problem of “Magic”’, in H. Lichtenberger and G. Oegema (eds.), *Jüdische Schriften in ihrem antic-jüdischen und urchristlichen Kontext* (Studien zu den Jüdischen Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit 1; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2002), pp. 258–69.
- Wagner, C.J., *Polyglotte Tobit-Synopse. Griechisch – Lateinisch – Syrisch – Hebräisch – Aramäisch. Mit einem Index zu den Tobit-Fragmenten vom Toten Meer* (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen Philologisch-Historische Klasse Dritte Folge, Band 258; MSU 28; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003).
- Weeks, S., ‘Restoring the Greek Tobit’, *JSJ* 44 (2013), pp. 1–15.
- ‘Some Neglected Texts of Tobit: The Third Greek Version’, in M. Bredin (ed.), *Studies in the Book of Tobit: A Multidisciplinary Approach* (Library of Second Temple Studies 55; London: T&T Clark International, 2006), pp. 12–42.
- Weeks, S., S. Gathercole, and L. Stuckenbruck, *The Book of Tobit: Texts from the Principal Ancient and Medieval Traditions. With Synopsis, Concordances, and Annotated Texts in Aramaic, Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and Syriac* (Fontes et Subsidia ad Bibliam Pertinentes 3; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004).

1 Maccabees

David S. Williams

Editions

(a) Standard Greek Editions

Göttingen, vol. IX.1, *Maccabaerorum liber I* (Kappler, 1967; 2nd ed.).

Rahlfs-Hanhart, vol. I, pp. 1039–98.

Swete, vol. III, pp. 594–661.

(b) Other Editions

Biblia Sacra iuxta vulgatam versionem (Gryson and Weber, 1984).

(c) Modern Translations

NETS (Zervos, 2007), pp. 478–502.

LXX.D (Tilly, 2009), pp. 664–93.

La Biblia Griega, vol. II (Fernández Marcos *et al.*, 2011), pp. 785–850.

I. General Characteristics

1 Maccabees opens with a brief account of the career of Alexander the Great (1.1-9). The book then presents a forty-year period of events, stretching from the accession of Antiochus IV Epiphanes in 175 B.C.E. to the death of the Jewish leader Simon in 134. In 1.16-64 various measures taken by Antiochus against the Jews and their religion are recounted, including the desecration of the Jerusalem temple; the construction of a citadel, near the temple, which was garrisoned by Greek soldiers; and the suppression of the Jewish cult. A description of a rebellion against these measures, spearheaded by Mattathias, a priest, then follows in 2.1-70. Three of Mattathias's five sons figure prominently in the remainder of the book. From 3.1 to 9.22 Judas (Maccabeus) leads the Jewish revolt. He is followed, after his death, by Jonathan, whose deeds are depicted

largely in 9.23–12.53. Finally, the leadership of the last of the three, Simon, is described in 13.1–16.24. The book closes with Simon's son, John Hyrcanus, becoming his successor.

The Hasmonean dynasty was established by the rise of Simon, and the fact that the book concludes with the establishment of his line through his son John is only one of several indicators of a pro-Hasmonean slant in the book. As Fischer ('Maccabees', p. 441) puts it, a 'thoroughgoing pro-Hasmonean...tendency...interpenetrates the entire work'. Nickelsburg (*Jewish Literature*, p. 106) considers 1 Maccabees nothing less than 'the gospel according to the Hasmoneans':

[The author] has recorded the history of the founding, the succession, and the establishment of the Hasmonean house, and he has documented its legitimacy by royal decree, popular acclaim, and the attestation of the God who has worked the divine purposes through the Hasmonean family and its early heroes. He has told the story of 'the family of those men through whom deliverance was given to Israel' (5.62).

One of the most challenging issues concerning 1 Maccabees is its dating of events. More than twenty specific dates for events are provided in the book, and it is often the case that the date is given in reference to the founding of the Seleucid era by Seleucus I Nicator in, according to our calendar, April 312–April 311 B.C.E. (see, for example, 1.10: 'Antiochus Epiphanes... began to reign in the one hundred thirty-seventh year of the kingdom of the Greeks'). The situation is complicated by the fact that the era was reckoned in different ways in the eastern and western parts of the Seleucid Empire, since the eastern part had a spring new year, while the western part began the new year in autumn. As a result, the Seleucid era might be regarded in different parts of the empire as starting in autumn 312 B.C.E, spring 312 B.C.E, or spring 311 B.C.E. The prevailing scholarly view is that two different dating systems are at work in 1 Maccabees—one for Jewish events that begins the Seleucid era with spring 311 B.C.E., and one for political events that begins the Seleucid era with autumn 312 B.C.E. See Bickermann (*God*, pp. 155–58) and Grabbe ('Maccabean Chronology').

A second issue is the extent to which the author draws upon biblical language and themes, introducing LXX terms and phrases into the narrative. The narrative sequences are thus portrayed in biblical terms and fulfilments or accomplishments are on a scale commensurable with biblical events. The historical accounts are therefore difficult at times to separate from the biblical themes.

II. Time and Place of Composition

The author's obvious and intimate familiarity with the geography and topography of Judea suggests that 1 Maccabees was composed there. The date of its composition is usually reckoned by reference to two considerations. First, the book appears to follow the death of John Hyrcanus in 104 B.C.E., since its final two verses (16.23-24) seem to summarise his accomplishments: 'The rest of the acts of John and his wars and the brave deeds that he did...are written in the annals of his high priesthood'. Second, there is a very favourable depiction of the Romans in 1 Maccabees 8, which presumably would not have been written following the conquest of Judea by Pompey in 63 B.C.E., during which he desecrated the temple and entered the Holy of Holies (as recorded by Josephus in *Ant.* 14.4.2-4 and *War* 1.4.3-6).

Recently, the question of the unity of 1 Maccabees has been reopened both by Martola (*Capture*) and by Williams (*Structure*), and this matter has implications for the dating of the book. The possibility of an original, shorter version of 1 Maccabees was raised during the nineteenth century, and Destinon (*Quellen*) provided the classic formulation of the theory. In subsequent years, several leading scholars (including Kautzsch, 'Das erste Buch'; and Hölscher, *Quellen*) accepted some form of the theory, and it became the majority opinion for several decades. The most common view among those who accepted the position was that 1 Maccabees had originally ended at 14.15, after which 14.16–16.24 was added by a later author or redactor; hence, the position became known as the Addendum theory. Those who supported the Addendum theory depended primarily on the fact that Josephus, in his presentation of Jewish history in *Antiquities*, follows 1 Maccabees closely up to the end of ch. 13, but seems no longer to use the book at approximately that point.

In Ettelson's thoroughgoing treatment of the issue ('Integrity'), he rejected the Addendum theory. Ettelson's major objection to the theory was that the evidence of Josephus constitutes an argument from silence. Ettelson also made some specific claims in support of the overall unity of 1 Maccabees. Following the publication of Ettelson's treatise, the Addendum theory rapidly declined in acceptance, and clearly the prevailing view at present is that 14.16–16.24 has always been an integral part of 1 Maccabees.

Yet the convergence of several items is provocative. In addition to being the approximate point at which Josephus seems to have stopped using 1 Maccabees as a source, 14.15 marks the end of the chiasmic structuring of the book observed by Williams (*Structure*), as well as the conclusion of the 'main story' of the book identified by Martola (*Capture*). Further, Williams (*Structure*, pp. 113–22) has suggested that a prominent feature in 1.1–14.15—namely, anti-Gentile rhetoric—is not present in 14.16–16.24. This difference appears to be of importance for the question of the unity of 1 Maccabees, as well as its date of composition.

Schwartz ('Israel') draws our attention to the fact that one of the more obvious features of 1 Maccabees is a pronounced hostility to Gentiles. A key facet of the anti-Gentile hostility in 1 Maccabees is, as Schwartz notes, the depiction of local Gentiles as thoroughly opposed to Jews. Given the evidence that he assembles, Schwartz takes issue with the common dating of 1 Maccabees near the end of the last quarter of the second century B.C.E. He points out how at that time the Hasmoneans were in the midst of an expansion into neighbouring lands and most of the local Gentiles were becoming judaised in some fashion. In this light, Schwartz ('Israel', p. 33) asks: '[1 Maccabees] unquestionably promotes the Hasmonean dynasty, yet expresses hostility precisely to the nations now being patronised by them... How can we account for this anomaly?' His solution is to propose a date of ca. 130 for the book (i.e., before the Hasmonean expansion). In order to make this claim, Schwartz suggests that 16.23–24 may have been added at some point, since, as we have already seen, these verses imply that the reign of John Hyrcanus (d. 104 B.C.E.) had ended.

As noted above, however, Williams has argued that the anti-Gentile rhetoric to which Schwartz points is present only in 1.1–14.15 and is missing from 14.16–16.24. Thus, though Schwartz holds that 1 Maccabees as a whole reflects a stance of hatred toward Gentiles, this may fairly be said only of 1.1–14.15. In the light of this finding, Williams (*Structure*, p. 122) has suggested that 1 Maccabees appeared in two editions. According to this theory, the first may be dated, following Schwartz, to ca. 130 B.C.E. This edition would have been limited to the two chiasmatically arranged sections, 1.1–6.17 and 6.18–14.15, and thus ended at 14.15. This first edition featured anti-Gentile hostility because it appeared before the Hasmonean expansion. A second, longer edition—with 14.16–16.24 appended—appeared ca. 100 B.C.E. This edition did not employ anti-Gentile rhetoric in its added material, because the Hasmonean expansion was in high gear.

III. Language

It is highly likely that 1 Maccabees was composed in Hebrew (see below § IV) and was later translated into Greek. Bartlett (*1 Maccabees*, p. 19) observes:

That the author should have written about the creation of a new independent Israel in the national language of the Jews itself says something about his pride in his country and its leaders (he uses the ancient name “Israel” over 40 times). That the book should have been translated into Greek early in its career—probably in the first century B.C.E.—is evidence of the growing importance of Greek in the Jewish world.

Even in translation, one can see that the syntax of 1 Maccabees reflects Hebrew biblical narratives to a great degree. This can be seen in the opening sentence, where Doran (*First Book*, p. 20) suggests the book begins in similar fashion to many other Hebrew narratives (e.g., Joshua, Judges, Ruth, 2 Samuel). This opening is followed by a string of clauses all connected by Greek *καί*, reflecting Semitic syntax without subordinate clauses. This influence of the source text on the Greek means that the Greek does not display the literary level of 2 Maccabees or other Greek compositions. On the Hebraisms in the syntax of 1 Maccabees, see Joüon (‘Quelques hébraïsmes’, pp. 204–206).

Bartlett (*1 Maccabees*, pp. 18–19), following Pfeiffer (*History*), suggests that the author of 1 Maccabees was influenced by the work of the Chronicler, accounting for the terms and vocabulary of the book: He planned the book as a sequel to 1 and 2 Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah, in order to bring the history of his people down to his own time. This would explain his archaic terminology, his incorporation of pious addresses and poems, and his use of official documents (cf. the book of Ezra).

On this latter point, regarding the use of letters and other official sources in 1 Maccabees, see especially Schunk (*Quellen*) and Neuhaus ('Quellen').

IV. Translation and Composition

There are several indications that 1 Maccabees was composed in Hebrew. First, there is the testimony of early Christian witnesses, specifically Origen and Jerome. Origen (as reported in Eusebius, *Hist.* 6.25) stated that the book had a Semitic title, *Sarbēth Sabanaiel*, evidentially a Greek transliteration from a Semitic original (perhaps the Aramaic rendering of an original Hebrew title). A range of scholarly reconstructions of this title have been proposed. As Bartlett (*1 Maccabees*, p. 18) notes, the most popular theory is probably *spr byt hsmōnʔym*, or 'the book of the house of the Hasmoneans'. The weakness of this proposal is that 1 Maccabees does not use the name 'Hasmonean', which instead comes from the works of Josephus (cf. *War* 1.3; *Ant.* 12.265). Another suggestion is *spr byt šar bny ʔl*, 'the book of the house of the leader of the sons of God'. Advocates of this reconstruction point to the repeated identifications of the Hasmonean brothers as leaders of the Jews in the book. Goldstein (*1 Maccabees*, pp. 16–17) suggests a highly different understanding by restoring the title as *spr byt srbny ʔl*, signifying 'the book of the dynasty of God's resisters'. According to Goldstein, this proposed title is ambiguous: "God's resisters" can mean either "resisters on behalf of God's chosen cause" or "those who resist God"... Many pious Jews regarded Mattathias as an arch-sinner for his audacious interpretations of the Torah and held his sons to be heinous sinners, too. The title in Origen could have been given the book by enemies of the Hasmonaeans.'

Regardless of the title's meaning, Origen's claim of a Semitic title is supported in some measure by Jerome's later statement in his *Prologus Galeatus*, '*Macchabaeorum primum librum hebraicum repperi*', which can be understood as signifying either 'I found the first book of Maccabees in Hebrew' or 'I found the first book of Maccabees to be a Hebrew book'.

Internal evidence confirms that the Greek text of 1 Maccabees is a translation. As noted above (§ III), the syntax of the book suggests that it was written in Hebrew. In addition, Hebrew idioms and transliterations from Hebrew appear throughout the book, as well as seeming mistranslations from Hebrew. Among the commentators, Grimm, Oesterley, and Abel are particularly interested in pointing out Semitisms in the Greek text.

Examples of Hebrew idioms reflected in the text abound. For the sake of illustration, confining attention to the first chapter of the book, one can readily spot the following: 1.3, 'the ends of the earth'; 1.3, 'his heart was lifted up'; 1.11, 'in those days'; 1.11, 'make a covenant'; 1.11, 'many disasters (lit. "evils") have come upon us' (lit. 'have found us'); 1.15, 'sold themselves to do evil'; 1.16, 'his kingdom was... established'; 1.17, 'with a strong force' (lit. 'a heavy force'); 1.29, 'two years later' (lit. 'two years of days'); and 1.30, 'he spoke peaceful words'. For a more complete listing, see Torrey ('Maccabees', cols. 2858–59). In addition to Semitic idiom, one can also observe occasions where the translator seems to have been baffled by particular words, which are left as transliterations. For instance, 14.27-28 states: 'On the eighteenth day of Elul...in Asaramel, in the great assembly of the priests and the people and the rulers of the nation and the elders of the country, the following was proclaimed to us...' The enigmatic word, Asaramel, resembles the Hebrew words for 'the court of the people of God'.

The apparent mistranslation in the book that is mentioned most often is in 1.29, which relates that Antiochus IV Epiphanes sent to Judea 'a chief collector of tribute'. This statement is usually understood as referring to the same event recorded in 2 Macc. 5.24, where the person who is sent is Apollonius, 'the captain of the Mysians'. The translator at this point seems to have misread שר המיסים *šar hammīssîm*, 'captain of the Mysians', as שר המוסים *šar hammūsîm*, 'chief collector of tribute'.

There has been virtual unanimity among scholars in regard to the division or structure of 1 Maccabees. The standard approach holds that the book has four main parts, arranged chronologically: first, an introduction (chs. 1–2), outlining the causes and beginnings of the Jewish uprising, followed by sections devoted to the careers of the three prominent Hasmonean brothers, Judas (3.1–9.22), Jonathan (9.23–12.53), and Simon (chs. 13–16). Martola (*Capture*) observes, however, that scholars rarely offer any justification for this structural pattern. As a result, he has investigated the issue by dividing 1 Maccabees into its smallest literary segments, and then synthesising the data by searching for continuities and connections among the segments. By this means, he links larger and larger sections of what he calls the ‘main story’ of 1 Maccabees, which concerns first the liberation of the temple and secondly the liberation of the Seleucid citadel. In this light, Martola views the essential components of 1 Maccabees (those pertaining to the main story) to be chs. 1–7; 9–11; and 12.24–14.15. He further holds that 8.1–32, 12.1–23, and 14.16–16.24 are additions to the main story, appearing either as what he calls ‘islands’, having little or nothing to do with their surroundings (8.1–32; 12.1–23), or as material that he claims follows the natural end of the course of events (14.16–16.24). Indeed, Martola suggests that 14.4–15, a eulogy of Simon, who led the Jews to victory over the inhabitants of the citadel, provided the ending of an original version of 1 Maccabees, which was expanded at some point.

Focusing on the role of repetition in the book, Williams (*Structure*) isolated three main sections within it: 1.1–6.17; 6.18–14.15; and 14.16–16.24. In general, Williams’s findings are similar to those of Martola, since Williams argues that the first two sections both emphasise the work of liberation of the temple and the citadel, which was accomplished under Judas and Simon, and promote a pro-Hasmonean ideology. According to Williams, the third section, which may well be an addendum, also touches on these themes but also stresses the establishment of Simon’s high priestly line. Williams further argues that the third section seems to consist of a single literary unit, but the first two sections are chiasmic structures, each composed of several individual literary units that correspond in an inverted fashion (for summary charts of these chiasmic structures, see Williams, *Structure*, p. 131; Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, p. 133).

V. Key Text-Critical Issues

The Hebrew original of 1 Maccabees is not extant. The Greek text is available to us in Codex Sinaiticus, Codex Alexandrinus, and Codex Venetus. It does not appear in Codex Vaticanus. Scholars generally consider that the three uncials are the offspring of a single Greek manuscript. Bartlett (*1 Maccabees*, p. 19) observes: ‘The Greek version of 1 Maccabees is written not in the colloquial style of the Greek Hellenistic world, in the language of the *Koinē*, but in the style of the Greek scriptures, the Septuagint, and the book may have been translated in this style as a deliberate attempt to associate the book with other writings accepted by the Jewish community’.

1 Maccabees also survives in versions in other languages, such as Syriac and Armenian. Some of these versions may derive from other translations. For example, the Latin version appears to reflect an ‘older, likewise Greek (and perhaps better) translation of the Hebrew original’ (Fischer, ‘Maccabees’, p. 440). Likewise, some isolated readings in the cursives ‘presuppose a better text in the passages in question than that represented in the three uncials’ (Oesterley, ‘First Book’, p. 65). On these issues, see Abel and Starkey (*Les livres*, p. 80); Goldstein (*1 Maccabees*, pp. 177–78); and Schunk (*I. Makkabäerbuch*, p. 290).

VI. Ideology and Exegesis

According to most scholars, the predominant theological motif in the book is the idea that God assists the Jews, alongside the notion that they must—to some degree—take matters into their own hands. It is common to note in this regard that 1 Maccabees does not mention God by name, preferring the circumlocution ‘Heaven’. A representative example is 3.18-19: ‘...in the sight of Heaven there is no difference between saving by many or by few. It is not on the size of the army that victory in battle depends, but strength comes from Heaven.’ Oesterley (‘First Book’, p. 61), for instance, observes:

The most striking characteristics are [that] the direct divine intervention in the nation’s affairs is not nearly so prominently expressed as in the books of the Old Testament [and] God is not mentioned by name in the whole book. The writer [of 1 Maccabees] is very far from being wanting

in religious belief and feeling; his conviction of the existence of an all-seeing Providence who helps those who are worthy comes out strongly... but he evidently has an almost equally strong belief in the truth expressed in the modern proverb, that 'God helps those who help themselves'... Just as there was a disinclination, on account of its transcendent holiness, to utter the name of God...so there arose also a disinclination to ascribe action among men directly to God, because of His inexpressible majesty.

This idea of God helping those who help themselves should be understood within the ancient context. To some modern sensibilities, the notion represents self-sufficiency. But this is clearly not the case in 1 Maccabees. Indeed, in 3.22 Judas asserts, concerning divine assistance, that 'He himself will crush them before us'. Since these words refer to Jewish military action and not to any miraculous intervention (as in 2 Macc. 3.24-28), we may refer to this belief as double causality. According to this understanding, events occur because of both human and divine causes, which are intertwined. For discussion of this concept in 1 Maccabees, see Williams, *Structure*, pp. 98–102.

VII. Reception History

1 Maccabees is a source for the origin of Hanukkah (see 4.36-59), which is perhaps its most lasting legacy. It is not part of the scripture of Jews and Protestants, but it is considered canonical by Roman Catholics, due to its stature in ancient tradition. In tandem with 2 Maccabees, the book is referred to by Clement of Alexandria, Hippolytus, Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, Eusebius, Aphraates, Jerome, Augustine, and Theodoret. The councils of Hippo (393) and Carthage (397 and 419) held that the books were sacred, and the councils of Florence (1441), Trent (1546), and Vatican I (1870) asserted that they are inspired by God (see McEleney, '1–2 Maccabees', p. 422).

It is worth noting that George Frideric Handel composed a three-part oratorio (with libretto by Thomas Morell) entitled *Judas Maccabaeus* (HWV 63) that is based primarily on 1 Maccabees 2–8. First performed in 1747, this oratorio was frequently reprised, becoming second only to Handel's famed *Messiah* in popularity.

Bibliography

- Abel, F.-M., *Les Livres des Maccabées* (Paris: Gabalda, 1949).
- Abel, F.-M., and J. Starcky, *Les livres des Maccabées* (Paris: Cerf, 1961).
- Arenhoevel, D., *Die Theokratie nach dem 1. und 2. Makkabäerbuch* (Mainz: Matthias-Grünwald, 1967).
- Bartlett, J.R., *1 Maccabees* (Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998).
- The First and Second Books of the Maccabees* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973).
- Bévenot, H., *Die Beiden Makkabäerbücher* (Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1931).
- Bickermann, E., *The God of the Maccabees* (Leiden: Brill, 1979) [trans. of *Der Gott der Makkabäer. Untersuchung über Sinn und Ursprung der makkabäischen Erhebung* (Berlin: Schocken, 1937)].
- ‘Makkabäerbücher’, *PW* XIV (1928), pp. 779–97.
- Brownlee, W.H., ‘Maccabees, Books of’, *IDB* 3 (1962), pp. 201–15.
- Collins, J.J., *Daniel, First Maccabees, Second Maccabees* (Wilmington: Michael Glazier, 1981).
- Dancy, J.C., *A Commentary on 1 Maccabees* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1954).
- Destinon, J., *Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus in der Jüd. Arch. Buch XII-XVII = Jüd. Krieg Buch I* (Kiel: Lipsius & Tischer, 1882).
- Dommershausen, W., *1 Makkabäer, 2 Makkabäer* (Würzburg: Echter, 1985).
- Doran, R. *The First Book of Maccabees: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections* (NIB 4; Nashville: Abingdon, 1996).
- Ettelson, H.W., ‘The Integrity of 1 Maccabees’, *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences* 27 (1925), pp. 249–384.
- Feldman, L.H., ‘Josephus’ Portrayal of the Hasmoneans Compared with 1 Maccabees’, in F. Parente and J. Sievers (eds.), *Josephus and the History of the Greco-Roman Period* (Leiden: Brill, 1994), pp. 41–68.
- Fischer, T., ‘Maccabees, Books of’, in *ABD*, vol. IV, pp. 439–50.
- Goldstein, J.A., *1 Maccabees* (AB 41; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1976).
- II Maccabees* (AB 41A; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1983).
- Grabbe, L.L., ‘Maccabean Chronology: 167–164 or 168–165 BCE’, *JBL* 110 (1991), pp. 59–74.
- Grimm, C., *Das erste Buch der Maccabäer* (Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1853).
- Hölscher, G., *Die Quellen des Josephus für die Zeit vom Exil bis zum jüdischen Kriege* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1904).
- Joüon, P., ‘Quelques hébraïsmes de syntaxe dans le premier livre des Maccabées’, *Bib* 3 (1922), pp. 204–206.
- Kampen, J., *The Hasidaeans and the Origin of Pharisaism: A Study in 1 and 2 Maccabees* (SBLSCS 24; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988).

The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint

- Kappler, W. (ed.), *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum*. Vol. IX.1, *Maccabaerorum liber I* (2nd ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967 [1936]).
- Kautzsch, E., 'Das erste Buch der Makkabäer', in E. Kautzsch (ed.), *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments* (1900; reprint, Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1962), pp. 24–81.
- Keil, C., *Commentar über die Bücher der Makkabäer* (Leipzig: Dörffling & Francke, 1875).
- Lefèvre, A., 'Maccabées (Livres I et II des.)', *DBSup* 5 (1957), pp. 597–612.
- Martola, N. *Capture and Liberation: A Study in the Composition of the First Book of Maccabees* (Åbo: Åbo Akademi, 1984).
- McEleney, N.J., '1–2 Maccabees', in R.E. Brown, J.A. Fitzmyer, and R.E. Murphy (eds.), *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1990), pp. 421–41.
- Melamed, E.Z., 'Josephus and 1 Maccabees: A Comparison', (Hebrew) *Eretz Israel* 1 (1951), pp. 122–30.
- Nelis, J.T., *I Makkabeeën* (Roermond: Romen & Zonen, 1972).
- Neuhaus, G., 'Quellen im I. Makkabaerbuch?', *JSJ* 5 (1974), pp. 162–75.
—*Studien zu den poetischen Stücken im I. Makkäbaerbuch* (Würzburg: Echter, 1974).
- Nickelsburg, G.W.E., *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah* (2nd ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005).
- Oesterley, W.O.E., 'The First Book of Maccabees', *APOT*, vol. I, pp. 67–123.
- Pfeiffer, R.H., *A History of New Testament Times with an Introduction to the Apocrypha* (New York: Harper, 1949).
- Schötz, P.D., *Ertes und Zweites Buch der Makkabäer* (Würzburg: Echter, 1948).
- Schunck, K.-D., *Die Quellen des I. und II. Makkabäerbuchers* (Halle: Niemeyer, 1954).
—*I. Makkabäerbuch* (JSHRZ 1.4; Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1980).
- Schwartz, S., 'Israel and the Nations Roundabout: 1 Maccabees and the Hasmonean Expansion', *JJS* 42 (1991), pp. 16–38.
- Tedesche, S., and S. Zeitlin, *The First Book of Maccabees* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1950).
- Torrey, C.C., 'Maccabees (Books)', in T.K. Cheyne (ed.), *Encyclopaedia Biblica* (4 vols.; London: Watts, 1902), III, cols. 2858–59.
- Williams, D.S., 'Recent Research in 1 Maccabees', *CRBS* 9 (2001), pp. 169–84.
—*The Structure of 1 Maccabees* (CBQMS 31; Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1999).

2 Maccabees

Frank Shaw

Editions

(a) Standard Greek Editions

- Göttingen, vol. IX.2, *Maccabaeorum liber II* (Hanhart and Kappler, 1976; 2nd ed.).
Rahlfs-Hanhart, vol. I, pp. 1099–1138.
Swete, vol. III, pp. 662–708.

(b) Other Greek Editions

- Les Livres des Maccabées* (Abel, 1949).¹

(c) Modern Translations

- NETS (Schaper, 2007), pp. 503–20.
LXX.D (Brodersen and Nicklas, 2009), pp. 694–716.
La Biblia Griega, vol. II (Fernández Marcos *et al.*, 2011), pp. 851–902.

I. General Characteristics

As it appears in the LXX canon, the book of 2 Maccabees contains the second account of the history of the Hasmonean uprising against the Greek-Macedonian overlords, the Seleucids, in the second century B.C.E. However, it is unlike 1 Maccabees in several ways. First, the book does not involve as comprehensive a time period; instead of the 40 years included in 1 Maccabees, this work covers fewer than 20 years and ends

1. Essential for any serious study of textual (and other) matters, this work contains a critical Greek text with copious commentary, a French translation, and many excursuses.

before the death of Judas Maccabeus in 160 B.C.E. One can easily make the case that the focus is almost exclusively on Judas whom the author frequently calls simply *ὁ Μακκαβαῖος*. His father is never named and his brothers receive merely passing mention (8.22; 10.19-20; 14.17). This contrasts starkly with the background and continuity of the family throughout 1 Maccabees.

Secondly, like certain other books of the LXX, most of 2 Maccabees has no parent Hebrew text and thus is not translation Greek. This greatly affects the kind of scholarship that has been done on it, especially in the areas of language and textual criticism. There are, however, some documents contained within the work. Two of them, prefatory letters comprising all of ch. 1 and the first part of ch. 2 (1.1-10a; 1.10b-2.18), are generally agreed to be from long-perished Semitic originals.

Thirdly, as can be inferred from the last point, the work is a collection and reworking of several documents. After the prefixed epistles the main part of the work (2.19-15.39) is itself not a freshly composed narrative but an epitome of a now lost five-volume history of the otherwise unknown Jason of Cyrene who likewise penned his five tomes in Greek (2.23, 26). In addition, the epitome itself purports to contain a number of letters (9.18-27; 11.16-21, 22-26, 27-33, 34-38), the authenticity of some of which has been questioned. The issue regarding which portions of the epitome come from the abbreviator and which from Jason has traditionally been a focus of considerable debate. To this must be added the sources utilised by Jason and any supplementary material not in Jason that our epitomiser employed. Some even believe there was further editing (a 'third hand') after the abbreviator.

Finally, several themes or motifs quickly manifest themselves to any critical reader working his or her way through the book. Among these are the role of the temple and the powerful portrayal of the martyrdoms in chs. 6 and 7 as well as the suicide of Razis in ch. 14—certainly designed to elicit sympathy and/or heroic individuals. Other elements that draw the reader's attention and which color the work's perspective include the frequent epiphanies of God that occur when Jews are in dire straits, and the relentless religious editorialising that appears not only to explain the plight of why the Jews find themselves oppressed but serves also to provide the 'just deserts' for apostates from within the fold or extremists from without.

Because of the last four of these themes, 2 Maccabees has often been viewed as ‘pathetic historiography’ (Bickerman, *God*, p. 95) or at least a late continuation of the ‘Deuteronomistic philosophy of history’ (deSilva, *Introducing*, p. 271), whereas 1 Maccabees has traditionally been seen as more sober and thus mainly historical. Furthermore, since the books sometimes disagree when reporting the same events (e.g., the victory over Nicanor in 1 Macc. 7.39-48 vs. that in 2 Macc. 15.20-36), past scholars have often opted to accept the account in 1 Maccabees as more reliable. However, over time material that is unique to 2 Maccabees has risen to historic status among modern critics, not least because it offers our fullest account of the events leading up to the Hasmonean uprising. Additionally, repeated statements in ch. 7, once by Razis at 14.46, and the account of the sacrifice for the dead at 12.43-45, offer strong testimony to the belief of individual bodily resurrection of the righteous dead, absent from 1 Maccabees.

For the title of the work see the discussions in Habicht (*2. Makkabäerbuch*, p. 169) and Goldstein (*II Maccabees*, pp. 3–4). For its relationship to 4 Maccabees see § VII.

2 Maccabees has been preserved in only two uncials: the famous fifth-century Codex Alexandrinus (A) and the Codex Venetus (V) of the eighth century. For further information on the latter MS see Swete (*OTG*, pp. xiv–xv). In addition to these majuscules the Göttingen editor Hanhart utilised 31 minuscule MSS. He also employed the Latin versions, both the Old Latin (8 MSS) and Vulgate (10 MSS), three printed editions of the Syriac, one Armenian edition, a small Coptic fragment, and testimony from the church fathers. For more information on general textual matters, including the character of the daughter translations, see Goldstein, *II Maccabees*, pp. 123–27.

This article was written before the important commentaries by Doran and Schwartz were published. For the latter, see the review by the present author in the *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* at www.bmcreview.org/2009/05/20090551.html.

II. Time and Place of Composition

As is so frequent with LXX books, ascertaining the precise date of the work’s composition is not possible, a fact made all the more difficult by

its complex character. What the relationship is between the epitome and the prefaced letters is not clear; the time span between Jason's original five-volume history and our extant summary of it is not known, nor is the date of Jason's original work itself determinable. Still, there are some clues to help one make an educated guess, first regarding the epitome.

We can establish a *terminus a quo* from the fact that the last recorded event in 2 Maccabees is the triumph over Nicanor (15.20-36), usually placed in 161 or 160 B.C.E. (revised Schürer, vol. III, p. 531; Rappaport, 'Nicanor', p. 1105). At the other end of the temporal spectrum the statement found in 15.37 that from Nicanor's defeat 'the city has been in the hands of the Hebrews' provides us with a *terminus ad quem*. This has generally been taken to mean the period before the Roman conquest in 63 B.C.E., although a few interpret the words to refer to any time prior to 70 C.E. Thus Zeitlin and Tedesche (*Second Book*, pp. 27-28) date 2 Maccabees to the period of Caligula during the reign of Agrippa I, 41-44 C.E., and Lévy opts for a time under Claudius or Nero ('Les deux livres', p. 33). However, the spirit of the passage, coupled with the overall friendly stance toward Rome evinced at 4.11 and 11.34-38, narrow the span to between 160 and 63 B.C.E. in the eyes of most investigators. To finesse the date further some see the general tone of 2 Maccabees as fitting the reign of John Hyrcanus or his successors; this would yield 'the years 125-63 B.C.E....as the general time span within which the epitome was written' (Attridge, 'Historiography', p. 177).

If we could establish that the epitomator is responsible for prefixing either or both of the prefatory epistles, we might be able to determine further the epitome's date, especially since the first one is self-dated to the year 188 of the Seleucid era, or 124 B.C.E. (1.9). As for the second letter, taken at face value it would be dated to ca. 164 B.C.E., since it is written after Antiochus IV's death and claims to have Judas Maccabee as one of its senders (1.10). However, here we move into murky waters because scholars are in no sort of agreement regarding the relationship of the anonymous abbreviator and the letters. Of course, both epistles could have been added by him, and some have gone to great lengths to defend the second letter as genuine (e.g., Wacholder, 'Letter'), but others (e.g., Momigliano, 'Second Book', pp. 82, 84-85; Attridge, 'Historiography', p. 177) have problems with the second one since it contradicts the

account of Antiochus Epiphanes' death found in the epitome itself (contrast 2.11-17 with 9.1-17). Furthermore, some scholars attribute this second letter to an otherwise unknown third hand, a redactor who is possibly responsible for other editing in the product that has come down to us (Habicht, *2. Makkabäerbuch*, pp. 174–76; Goldstein, *II Maccabees*, pp. 157–67). Therefore, a number are willing to countenance that our summariser of Jason is responsible for adding only the first letter, and this is the reason why some simply give the year 124 as the date of the work (Momigliano, 'Second Book', pp. 83–84; Habicht, *2. Makkabäerbuch*, p. 174; revised Schürer, vol. III, p. 532; Harrington, '2 Maccabees', p. 1519). Nevertheless, since all this is speculation, it is wisest to concur with Bartlett: 'none of these points can be used with certainty, and the book may belong almost anywhere in the last 150 years B.C.' (*First*, p. 215).

As to where the epitomiser wrote, again, little of any surety can be said. As testimony to this fact, a large number of scholars simply avoid the issue, even in sources where one might not expect this (Attridge, 'Historiography'; Collins, *Daniel*; Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*; revised Schürer). If the abbreviator is responsible for the high rhetorical style of the Greek rather than Jason (a debatable point), then it perhaps seems more likely that he came from the diaspora than from Palestine (Brownlee, 'Maccabees', p. 209; see, however, Doran, *Temple Propaganda*, pp. 112–13; Van Henten, *Maccabean Martyrs*, p. 50). But whether this was in Syria or Asia Minor (Bickerman, 'Héliodore', p. 36), more specifically Antioch (Zeitlin and Tedesche, *Second Book*, p. 20), Alexandria (Abel, *Les Livres*, p. xxxiv; Metzger, *Introduction*, p. 140), or elsewhere, we simply cannot know.

III. Language

It is difficult to attempt in any successful way to disentangle a 'layer' of material that can be confidently attributed to Jason. On the other hand, there are a few *loci* in our extant text where one can with fair assurance declare a section of the contents the work of the anonymous abbreviator: certainly 2.19-32 and 15.38-39; very probably 4.17; 5.17-20; 6.12-17; and 7.42. Beyond these there is considerable disagreement. Given this situation, with the exception of the prefatory letters and the inserted

letters from chs. 9 and 11, the discussion below follows Momigliano ('Second Book', p. 82) and Doran (*Temple Propaganda*, pp. 22–24) in treating the epitome as a literary whole. Thus the terms 'author, writer', unless otherwise specified, refer to the one(s) responsible for the text of the epitome as we have it.

In the introduction to his Greek grammar Smyth draws a useful distinction between spoken and literary Hellenistic Greek: 'The literary form, a compromise between Attic usage and the spoken language, was an artificial and almost stationary idiom from which the living speech drew farther and farther apart' (*Greek Grammar*, p. 4A). The reader who is mainly used to the living Greek found in most of the LXX and the New Testament, and who then encounters 2 Maccabees, will notice a weighty distinction. For the bulk of the epitome, vocabulary is rich, syntax is varied and sometimes complex, lengthy descriptions appear, and literary and rhetorical devices proliferate. This was the norm in both poetry and prose of the greater Hellenistic world (Gutzwiller, *Guide*, pp. 41–43, 60–61, 151–52), and Jason and his epitomator had assimilated these standards. Thus the Greek of 1 Maccabees can be said to be 'ordinary *Koine* without literary features' (Kilpatrick, 'Review', p. 12; reprint, p. 421) while '2 Maccabees is written in literary *Koiné*, and not in LXX Greek' (Katz, 'Eleazar's Martyrdom', p. 122).

Specific studies in the language of 2 Maccabees have been limited, but all agree on its generally high character. Although two dissertations have been written covering the Greek of 2 Maccabees (Richnow, Bunge) as well as two articles (Mugler, Gil), it was not until Doran penned his 1981 monograph on the purpose and character of the work that an examination became widely available which explores in some depth the character of 2 Maccabees' language. While Doran's purpose is not the linguistic nature and style of our text *per se*, he states that he felt an obligation to discuss the language of 2 Maccabees since the earlier studies had in various ways fallen short of offering an at least moderately comprehensive look at the work's syntax and style: Bunge's literary analysis is primarily for the purpose of source criticism (Doran, *Temple Propaganda*, pp. 1–2); Richnow's work 'spends five pages on syntax, 24 pages on word choice, and 4 pages on rhetorical techniques. More space is devoted to the role of metaphor than to the syntax of the work'; while Gil's contribution is likewise devoted entirely to rhetoric (Doran, *Temple*

Propaganda, p. 24). Doran's book is divided into four parts, all with the goal of ascertaining the literary composition of 2 Maccabees. His second chapter 'The Syntax and Style of 2 Maccabees' contains most of the pertinent material on language (pp. 24–46). The following brief comments are mainly the observations of the present writer.

The first prefixed epistle (1.1-10a) is just 184 words, has almost complete parataxis, yet yields seven optatives of wishing (vv. 2-6). The second prefatory letter (1.10b–2.18) is considerably more sophisticated: the translator uses *ὡς* in a variety of functions; he is fond of correlatives; his syntax, at least as we have it, is too often strained. Perhaps surprisingly the second letter contains 15 LXX *hapax legomena* (according to LEH). Two of these are neologisms (*συγκεραυνῶ* 1.16; *μεταγίνομαι* 2.2). The best-known ambiguity is what ὕδωρ παχύ (lit., 'thick water') in 1.20 means.

The main section of 2 Maccabees, the epitome, is heavily marked by wide-ranging *variatio* (or *μεταβολή*) in both vocabulary and syntax. *Hapax legomena* are prevalent throughout the epitome, both those limited to within the corpus of the LXX and even occasionally in the wider sense of all Greek literature. Excluding proper nouns, the LEH lexicon yields 372 words in 2 Maccabees that are nowhere else found in the LXX. As for neologisms, LEH provides confirmed instances that number 55 and another 19 that may be. For example, our writer likes to employ adverbs with the ending *-ηδόν*: *ἀγγεληδόν*, 'like a herd, in droves', 3.18 and 14.14; *σπειρηδόν*, 'like a tactical unit, by cohorts, in troops', 5.2 and 12.20; *λεοντηδόν*, 'like a lion', 11.20; and *κρουνηδόν*, '[gushing] like a spring', 14.45. The last two of these are neologisms and LEH lists *σπειρηδόν* as possibly one. The author also has a penchant for employing the prefix *δυσ-* to indicate a negative meaning (especially on nouns and adjectives), far more so than in any other LXX book. Out of 32 such words in the LXX 14 occur in 2 Maccabees. The next nearest to this frequency is 3 Maccabees with ten, and the two works share three of these words.²

2. The totals are the following: Genesis ×1; Exodus ×1; Job ×1; Proverbs ×1; Isaiah ×1; Jeremiah ×1; 4 Maccabees ×1; 1 Esdras ×2; Additions to Esther ×2; 1 Maccabees ×2; Wisdom ×3; 3 Maccabees ×10; 2 Maccabees ×14. The shared words are *δυσμένεια*, *δυσσεβής*, and *δυσφόρως*.

When it comes to syntax, we likewise see considerable sophistication and intentional variation. The writer's use of the μέν...δέ construction is the richest in the LXX, followed by 4 Maccabees and Wisdom. He commonly employs attributive and circumstantial participles, both in agreement with nouns within clauses and absolutely; these convey temporal, causal, concessive, conditional, and consequential meanings or simply express some attendant circumstance. However, the supplementary participle makes a poor showing. Besides participles our author has a fondness for indicating cause with γάρ as well as διά with an accusative. Consequence is conveyed most frequently with οὖν and (sometimes complex) result clauses. Necessity is related through ἀναγκάζω/ἀνάγκη [ἔστίν], δεῖ in the imperfect, the hortatory subjunctive, imperatives/prohibitive aorists, and, most surprisingly, five instances of -τέος verbal adjectives. This construction is found elsewhere in the LXX only in the Letter of Jeremiah, likewise five times, and once in Proverbs (26.23). Purpose is expressed with ἵνα (μή) + subjunctive, the simple or articular infinitive, and the future participle. The optative mood is found merely thrice, but our writer has a preference for verbal periphrasis and the pluperfect tense. A number of rhetorical devices are present, including litotes, the simile, metaphor, irony, alliteration, chiasmus, and especially paronomasia.

IV. Translation and Composition

The only translation issues per se in the work have to do with the real possibility that the letters prefixed to the epitome (1.1-10a; 1.10b-2.18) were composed in Hebrew or Aramaic and at some time later were translated into the form we now have. Habicht calls this view 'the universal opinion of scholarship' (2. *Makkabäerbuch*, p. 170 n. 15; author's translation). Hanhart discusses the matter (2. und 3. *Makkabäerbüches*, pp. 28-31), and Kilpatrick even argues for accepting six readings from Hanhart's apparatus on this basis (*Zum Text*, p. 18; reprint, p. 426). Torrey has produced a theoretical Aramaic *Urtext* of these letters ('Letters', pp. 141-46). Given how important 'translation technique' is in modern LXX studies, it is remarkable that evidently no one has yet to take his Semitic text (or create another) and apply this concept to it, a project that would likely add new insight to the matter and would be the

necessary step to assessing properly the only translation concern in 2 Maccabees. For alleged Hebraisms in the epitome, see Doran, *Temple Propaganda*, pp. 22, 34–36.

When it comes to the composition of the work, much ink has been spilled on the issues of the prefatory letters, who wrote them, and whether they are genuine or (at least partially) forged. Since the seminal article by Bickerman ('Ein jüdischer Festbrief') three problems have *generally* been put to rest: (a) How many epistles are present, namely two, *contra* a number of earlier scholars who judged one or three; (b) that within the first letter there is merely a quotation from an earlier missive (1.7-8); (c) that the first epistle is 'a genuine document that is shown by the dating at the end to be written in the year 124/3' (Habicht, *2. Makkabäerbuch*, p. 199; author's translation). The situation with the second letter is more complex. Some take this work to be a complete forgery (Habicht, *2. Makkabäerbuch*, pp. 175, 199–200; Goldstein, *II Maccabees*, pp. 157–71; Attridge, 'Historiography', p. 177), while others try to salvage parts as authentic (Momigliano, *Prime linee*, pp. 84–94; Bunge, 'Untersuchungen', pp. 32–152), and still others accept the whole thing as genuine (Torrey, 'Letters', pp. 119, 124–30; Flusser, 'Jerusalem', pp. 277–80; Wacholder, 'Letter', *passim*). Indeed Fischer goes so far as to say, 'it appears that this document is really the sole surviving record of Judas Maccabeus himself' ('Maccabees', p. 444). Naturally, one's take on who is (are) responsible for the second letter depends on one's position regarding its authenticity. As for the structure of this rather complex epistle, the model of Wacholder ('Letter', p. 92), who divides it into eight components, is helpful.

A disputed issue regarding the composition of 2 Maccabees is what belongs to Jason, to the epitomator, and to a possible third hand. Different scholars assess what are likely the contributions of the anonymous abbreviator differently. For example, Schaper (NETS, p. 503) is rather conservative³ whereas others are open in asserting more of the book as non-Jasonic.⁴ Indeed, Zambelli declares the whole of chs. 12–15 purely

3. Listing only 2.19-32; 4.17; 5.17-20; 6.12-17; all of ch. 7; 12.43-45; 14.37-46; 15.37-39.

4. Attridge accepts all of the *loci* Schaper does and considers further passages such as 3.24-25, 27-28, 30; 9.18-27; and 15.36 to be from the epitomator ('Historiography', p. 178 n. 61).

post-Jasonic ('Composizione', pp. 286–87). For Doran, the overall concept of being able to figure out what is Jason's and what belongs to the abbreviator is moot (*Temple Propaganda*, p. 111 n. 3).

The notion of a further redactor depends on the acceptance of the idea that at least the second prefatory letter was added by someone after the epitomiser and is a convenient source to whom any untidy leftovers can be attributed. This thought has been generally well-received (Kolbe, *Beiträge*, pp. 119–22; Shunck, *Quellen*, p. 99; Lévy, 'Les deux livres', p. 24; Hanhart, 'Zur Zeitrechnung', p. 74; Arenhoeval, *Theokratie*, p. 113; Habicht, *2. Makkabäerbuch*, pp. 174–76), though getting specific about just what in our book beyond the second introductory epistle is the third hand's work has been difficult, if not impossible. Other scholars either reject the final redactor hypothesis (Momigliano, 'Second Book', p. 83) or are silent about it (Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization*, pp. 381–90; Doran, *Temple Propaganda*; Schaper, NETS, p. 503).

Yet more tenuous is the issue of what sources each contributor had at his disposal. The problem has led numerous scholars to posit a variety of complex solutions. A number of theoretical documents have been proposed which Jason is supposed to have employed: diaries of the high priest Onias, Jason, and Menelaus, a Seleucid chronicle, a documentary archive, and a biography of Judas have all been postulated by Schunck (*Quellen*, pp. 97–115, 126). Bunge proceeds from a similar *Life of Judas* notion, from which those responsible for 1 and 2 Maccabees drew ('Untersuchungen', pp. 206–329). Goldstein renames the theoretical vita of Judas 'the Common Source', and speculates further on a new 'Legendary Source' (*II Maccabees*, pp. 28–54). While the above queries have produced 'ingenious' proposals, in the end we must agree with Tcherikover: 'There is no answer to all these questions, nor shall we ever discover one' (*Hellenistic Civilization*, p. 388).

As for the organisation of the book, several models have been proposed. An older but still useful paradigm may be found in Pfeiffer (*History*, pp. 499–506), who largely follows traditional chapter divisions. Nickelsburg (*Jewish Literature*, p. 118) has proposed a thematically driven pattern for the epitome: (1) Blessing (3.1–40); (2) Sin (4.1–5.10); (3) Punishment (5.11–6.17); (4) Turning point (6.18–8.4); (5) Judgement and salvation (8.5–15.36). Doran's model focuses on the role of the temple (*Temple Propaganda*, pp. 47–76).

V. Key Text-Critical Issues

The Göttingen edition is not simply, or even primarily, the work of Hanhart. The editor of the series' volume of 1 Maccabees, Kappler, who had written his dissertation on the textual history of 2 Maccabees ('De memoria'), prepared a text and a critical apparatus of 2 Maccabees before his death. Hanhart took Kappler's text and apparatus over and used them relatively unchanged. In his 'Foreword' he notes that where his textual judgement differed from Kappler's he employed 'Ka' in the apparatus (Göttingen, p. 5). This occurs only 34 times in over 2000 textual entries. For the LXX reader not familiar with Hanhart's edition the following two points, perhaps easily missed from a cursive reading of his introduction, will be helpful when employing it: (a) Much information necessary to use his critical apparatus is to be found in the Göttingen edition of 1 Maccabees (ed. Kappler vol. IX.1, 1936), including the dates of most MSS and a far more comprehensive key for the sigla than is found in the 2 Maccabees volume's introduction. (b) The device of a hyphen between numeric sigla is not meant to include or skip over sequentially numbered MSS; rather, it indicates that there is some close historical relationship between the MSS cited. For example, 46-52 means that in the referenced *locus* both MSS 46 and 52 have the same reading and Hanhart feels these two cursives share a textual affinity more closely than other MSS. Lastly, there is no difference between Hanhart's first edition of 1959 and the second of 1976—it is just a reprint.

Useful editions of the Greek text other than Hanhart's are those listed under Editions (above). Swete's text of 2 Maccabees is based on only MSS A and V. It is not quite accurate to call it a diplomatic edition in our book since he fairly frequently rejects readings from A and places those from V into his text, and he accepts some emendations of previous scholars. His greatest value is perhaps his punctuation which can differ significantly from Rahlfs-Hanhart and influence the modern reader's take on a passage. In his critical apparatus Rahlfs employed A, V, the Latin, the Lucianic recension, and his well-known generic abbreviations ('pau', 'mss gr', etc.). Furthermore, he occasionally takes note of previous editors' readings and, more significantly, the dissertation of Kappler. The work of Abel is unique among serious savants of 2 Maccabees, and any current researcher of 2 Maccabees can only ignore it at considerable

peril. On the textual side this work is by no means as comprehensive as Hanhart when it comes to number of entries, yet at times he delves into textual matters in significant depth in his comments and/or apparatuses.

2 Maccabees is not a particularly well-preserved work, but the overriding textual issue is not so much that it has numerous problem passages (which it certainly contains) as it is how to deal with them. The real debate centres on the philosophy of Hanhart vs. just about everyone else who has studied the matter. Schaper contains a summary discussion of the subject (NETS, pp. 503–505). The three points of contention are the following: (a) the skimpy nature of Hanhart’s apparatus; (b) his conservative trust in mainly four MSS along with his failure to acknowledge the unusual positive role of the readings (for 2 Maccabees) of the Lucianic recension; (c) his unwillingness to break from the textual paradigm usually held for most other LXX books, those that have a Semitic mother text, and accept or more frequently at least list previous editors’ proposed emendations. Hanhart’s main critics are Katz (‘Text’, pp. 10–18), Kilpatrick (‘Review’, pp. 11–13; reprint, pp. 419–21), and Habicht (*2. Makkabäerbuch*, pp. 192–94).

A simple example drawn from the final part of 10.10 will suffice to show the first shortcoming in Hanhart. It reads *δηλώσομεν αὐτὰ συντέμνοντες τὰ συνέχοντα τῶν πολέμων κακά*, lit., ‘we will show them [the affairs of Antiochus Eupator] by summarising the encompassing evils of the wars’. One of several textual issues here has to do with the word *συνέχοντα*. Hanhart’s apparatus informs the reader that this word is missing from MS V because of *homoioleuton*. He gives no other sources that lack the participle. However, in his discussion Abel (*Livres*, p. 408) notes that five Latin witnesses also omit this word. Thus Bénévot translates, ‘The [] sufferings of war’ (*Makkabäerbücher*, p. 218; author’s translation). While it is possible that *homoioleuton* took place in Greek before the Latin translations were done and their testimony is therefore secondary, this part of the Latin tradition may not be based on Greek *homoioleuton*, and the reader using the Göttingen edition alone would never be aware of the other testimony.

The second criticism highlights that Hanhart relies too heavily on MSS A, 55, 347, 771, and that there are a number of passages where the Lucianic witnesses, in the eyes of some scholars, preserve a more

original text (see Habicht, *2. Makkabäerbuch*, p. 192; Katz, 'Text', pp. 11, 24; Kilpatrick, 'Review', pp. 18–19; reprint pp. 426–27). The third critique of Hanhart basically has to do with his failure to concede that for works like 2 Maccabees, which are far more 'written in the traditions of Greek historiography' (Attridge, 'Historiography', p. 157) than biblical ones, the canons of classical textual criticism need to be applied (Habicht, *2. Makkabäerbuch*, p. 193; Schaper, NETS, p. 505). In this field textual emendations are not only more common but are indeed desirable.

Hanhart tried to respond soon after his text of 2 Maccabees appeared in his textual commentary (*Zum Text*). Although this work contains some very detailed discussions of many passages, he has not really dealt with the criticisms of his textual philosophy. Rather, he takes refuge in the notion of the *lectio difficilior potior* (*Zum Text*, p. 57). While this is an important textual principle, Hanhart has taken it too far. As two classical textual critics have put it regarding this principle: 'it has probably been overworked, for there is a temptation to use it as a defence of anomalous syntax or usage; in such cases the more difficult reading may be more difficult because it is wrong' (Reynolds and Wilson, *Scribes*, pp. 221–22). Thus academics need to employ the accumulated thoughts and emendations proposed by those well-versed in Hellenistic non-biblical Greek, such as Niese, Nestle, Risberg, Wilhelm, Katz/Walters ('Text'; *Text*), and Kilpatrick (see too NETS, p. 504 and n. 7). Finally, the modern reader of 2 Maccabees in Greek should always consider the important register in Habicht (*2. Makkabäerbuch*, pp. 284–85), where he lists in Greek the 81 textual differences between Hanhart's judgements and the readings he used in his translation.

VI. Ideology and Exegesis

There is a long tradition in 2 Maccabean scholarship of reading the entire work as so pro-Jerusalem temple that it comprises a polemic against the Oniad sanctuary at Leontopolis. The first letter is cited as support for this concept, as carrying reproachful undertones toward Egyptian Jews for worshipping in a place outside of the Jerusalem shrine (Bickerman, 'Ein jüdischer Festbrief', pp. 250–54). Many academics have since subscribed to this view (Abel, *Livres*, p. xlv; Momigliano, 'Second Book',

p. 83; Habicht, *2. Makkabäerbuch*, p. 186; Goldstein, *II Maccabees*, pp. 24, 138). However, the postulate has been properly rejected as imbued more with conjecture than substance (Arenhoeval, *Theokratie*, pp. 100–102; Doran, *Temple Propaganda*, pp. 11–12; Collins, *Between Athens*, p. 81). It is better to see the initial epistle positively as ‘full of...best wishes’ (Doran, ‘Jewish Hellenistic’, p. 275).

The second letter is problematic beyond its contradictions with the epitome regarding Antiochus IV’s death. Its multi-segmented character is difficult to grapple with, and it contains both similarities and differences with the earlier epistle and the epitome. The strained account at 1.16–36 (the anachronism with Nehemiah; the Persians taking Judeans captive), as well as the further legendary precedents involving Jeremiah, Moses, Solomon, and again Nehemiah (2.1–18), all combine to suggest ‘that observing Hanukkah was still controversial’ (Harrington, ‘2 Maccabees’, p. 1521), and Jews from the homeland were going to considerable lengths to get their Egyptian coreligionists to begin celebrating it (2.26). Continuity of temples seems to be the goal of relating the stories at 2.1–15, yet it seems odd that the ark, tent, and incense altar are still hidden in some undisclosed cave. A bit of eschatology is present here, the longed-for ingathering of scattered Jews at 2.7, 18, similar to sentiments expressed in other LXX works not in the Hebrew canon: Sir. 36.13, 16 and Tob. 13.13.

As for the epitome’s ideology, differences of opinion exist, of course, among interpreters, yet these are usually over which particular concepts are the most stressed in it. In the large picture there is considerable agreement on overlapping ideas. Habicht emphasises ‘guilt and atonement, punishment and grace’ (*2. Makkabäerbuch*, p. 186; author’s translation); the related theme of reconciliation through suffering, and specifically the martyrs as saviours, is the starting point of Van Henten’s book (*Maccabean Martyrs*). Brownlee highlights the temple’s sanctity (‘Maccabees’), and Doran (*Temple Propaganda*) takes temple emphasis in another direction, documenting that the topos of a divinity defending his/her temple, especially by means of an epiphany, was a commonplace in the Greek world (‘2 Maccabees’, pp. 113–14; *Temple Propaganda*, pp. 103–104). Finally, there is general consensus that the work has Greek as well as Jewish roots.

Noteworthy differences in interpreting 2 Maccabees include the following: (a) Habicht denies irony in the work (*2. Makkabäerbuch*, pp. 190, 243 n. 35c), while Doran, following earlier translators (Good-speed, RSV, NAB), correctly understands the final words at 8.35 as ironic. (b) Both Bunge ('Untersuchungen', pp. 184–90) and Momigliano ('Second Book', pp. 87–88) have interpreted 2 Maccabees from the perspective of a festal legend, but Doran criticises this viewpoint's weaker supports (*Temple Propaganda*, pp. 105–107). (c) Bickerman's labelling of 2 Maccabees as the prime example of the Greek genre of 'pathetic historiography' (*God*, p. 95), widely accepted since then (Abel, *Livres*, p. xxxvii; Pfeiffer, *History*, p. 518; Goldstein, *II Maccabees*, p. 34; Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, p. 118; VanderKam, *Introduction*, p. 68; Harrington, '2 Maccabees', p. 1520), has been rejected as a fictitious category in antiquity (Walbank, 'History', pp. 233–34; Doran, '2 Maccabees', pp. 107–10; *Temple Propaganda*, pp. 84–90; cf. Attridge, 'Historiography', p. 178; Collins, *Between Athens*, pp. 78–83; deSilva, *Introducing*, p. 271). (d) The use of 2 Macc. 7.28 as a key passage for the notion that *creatio ex nihilo* has Jewish roots (Johnson, 'Second Book', pp. 276–77; cf. Brownlee, 'Maccabees', p. 207; Habicht, *2. Makkabäerbuch*, p. 187) has been rejected by more recent academics (Goldstein, *II Maccabees*, pp. 307–308; Harrington, '2 Maccabees', p. 1532).

VII. Reception History

2 Maccabees has had a fairly healthy *Nachleben* both in Judaism and Christianity. In the case of the former, the work, likely along with 1 Maccabees, must have helped bring about the institution of Hanukkah, as the prefatory letters attest. The other influence has largely been due to the memorable account of Eleazar in ch. 6, and especially the mother and seven sons in ch. 7. The earliest work that demonstrates this is 4 Maccabees. Usually dated to the first century C.E. (Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, p. 226; deSilva, *Introducing*, pp. 355–56), this treatise obviously has 2 Maccabees as its base. Not only does the story line indicate such but so does the shared Greek vocabulary: over forty words are common to 2 and 4 Maccabees alone in the LXX. For the notion that the Additions to Esther and 3 Maccabees show the influence of 2 Maccabees, see Doran, *Temple Propaganda*, pp. 106–108, 111–12. For rabbinic

material that may reflect some knowledge of 2 Maccabees, see Doran ('Martyr'), Goldstein (*I Maccabees*, p. 26 n. 58; *II Maccabees*, p. 297), Zeitlin and Tedesche (*Second Book*, pp. 82–86), and Momigliano ('Second Book', p. 88).

The earliest generally accepted allusions to 2 Maccabees within Christianity come from the New Testament, specifically the 'letter' to the Hebrews 11.35b (Attridge, *Epistle*, pp. 349–50). The early church's suffering persecution at the hands of the Romans caused 2 Maccabees to become popular among some Christians. Noteworthy patristic references are Origen's *Exhortatio ad martyrium* (22–27), Cyprian of Carthage, *Ad Fortunatum (de exhortatione martyrii)* (11), John Chrysostom's three small homilies *De Macabeos* and *De Eleazaro et septem pueris*, and Gregory of Nazianus's homily 15, *De Macabeis*. In some cases it is not clear how much 4 Maccabees rather than 2 Maccabees served as their basis (Mayer, *St. John Chrysostom*, pp. 123, 135; Vinson, 'Gregory'). For further possible influence of 2 Maccabees in the early church's handling of persecution, see Frend, *Martyrdom*, pp. 17–22, 44–46. Finally, the LXX manuscript tradition itself speaks potently for the work's influence in Christianity.

Bibliography

- Abel, F.-M., *Les Livres des Maccabées* (2nd ed.; EBib; Paris: Gabalda, 1949).
- Arenhoevel, D., *Die Theokratie nach dem 1. und 2. Makkabäerbuch* (Walberberger Studien der Albertus-Magnus-Akademie, Theologische Reihe 3; Mainz: Matthias-Grünwald, 1967).
- Attridge, H.W., *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989). —'Historiography', in M.E. Stone (ed.), *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), pp. 157–84.
- Attridge, H.W. (ed.), *The HarperCollins Study Bible, Fully Revised and Updated* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006).
- Bartlett, J.R., *The First and Second Books of the Maccabees* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973).
- Bénevot, H., *Die beiden Makkabäerbücher* (Die heilige Schrift des Alten Testamentes IV.4; Bonn: P. Hanstein, 1931).
- Bickerman, E., *The God of the Maccabees* (Leiden: Brill, 1979) [trans. of *Der Gott der Makkabäer. Untersuchung über Sinn und Ursprung der makkabäischen Erhebung* (Berlin: Schocken, 1937)].
- 'Héliodore au temple de Jérusalem', *AIPHOS* 7 (1939–44), pp. 5–40.

- ‘Ein jüdischer Festbrief vom Jahre 124 v. Chr.’, *ZNW* 32 (1933), pp. 233–54.
- ‘Makkabäerbücher’, *PW* XIV (1928), pp. 779–97.
- Brownlee, W.H., ‘Maccabees, Books of’, in G. Buttrick (ed.), *The Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. III (5 vols.; New York: Abingdon, 1962), pp. 201–15.
- Bunge, J.G., ‘Untersuchungen zum zweiten Makkabäerbuch’ (Ph.D. dissertation, Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität zu Bonn, 1971).
- Collins, J.J., *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora* (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000).
- Daniel, First Maccabees, Second Maccabees* (Wilmington: M. Glazier, 1981).
- Collins, J.J., and G.W.E. Nickelsberg (eds.), *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms* (SBLSCS 12; Chico: Scholars Press, 1980).
- deSilva, D.A., *Introducing the Apocrypha* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002).
- Doran, R., *2 Maccabees: A Critical Commentary* (ed. H.W. Attridge; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012).
- ‘2 Maccabees and “Tragic History”’, *HUCA* 50 (1979), pp. 107–14.
- ‘The Jewish Hellenistic Historians before Josephus’, *ANRW* II.20.1 (1986), pp. 246–97.
- ‘The Martyr: A Synoptic View of the Mother and Her Seven Sons’, in J.J. Collins and G.W.E. Nickelsberg (eds.), *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms* (SBLSCS 12; Chico: Scholars Press, 1980), pp. 189–221.
- Temple Propaganda: The Purpose and Character of 2 Maccabees* (CBQMS 12; Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1981).
- Fischer, T., ‘Maccabees, Books of’, in *ABD*, vol. IV, pp. 439–50.
- Flusser, D., ‘Jerusalem in the Literature of the Second Temple Period’, in A. Shoshan, (ed.), *We-im Bi-gyurot: asufat pirke ‘iyun u-mehkar be-‘inyene ha-arets, ha-lashon ve-sifrut Yisra’el: minhah li-Re’uven Mas ule-ra’yato* (Jerusalem, 1974), pp. 263–94 (Hebrew).
- Frend, W.H.C., *Martyrdom and Persecution in the Early Church* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1965).
- Gil, L., ‘Sobre el estilo de libro de los Macabeos’, *Emerita* 26 (1958), pp. 11–32.
- Goldstein, J.A., *I Maccabees* (AB 41; Garden City: Doubleday, 1976).
- II Maccabees* (AB 41A; New York: Doubleday, 1983).
- Goodspeed, E., *The Apocrypha: An American Translation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938).
- Gutzwiller, K., *A Guide to Hellenistic Literature* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2007).
- Habicht, C., *2. Makkabäerbuch* (2nd ed.; JSHRZ 1.3; Gütersloh: G. Mohn, 1979).
- Hanhart, R., and W. Kappler (eds.), *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum*. Vol. IX.2, *Maccabaeorum liber II* (2nd ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976 [1959]).
- Zum Text des 2. und 3. Makkabäerbüches* (MSU 8; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961).
- ‘Zur Zeitrechnung des I und II Makkabäerbüches’, in A. Jepsen and R. Hanhart (eds.), *Untersuchungen zur Israelitisch-jüdische Chronologie* (BZAW 88; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1964), pp. 55–96.

The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint

- Harrington, D.J., '2 Maccabees', in H.W. Attridge (ed.), *The HarperCollins Study Bible, Fully Revised and Updated* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), pp. 1519–47.
- Henten, J.W. van, *The Maccabean Martyrs as Saviours of the Jewish People: A Study of 2 and 4 Maccabees* (JSJSup 57; Leiden: Brill, 1997).
- Jepsen, A., and R. Hanhart (eds.), *Untersuchungen zur Israelitisch-jüdische Chronologie* (BZAW 88; Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1964).
- Johnson, S., 'The Second Book of the Maccabees', in B. Metzger, (ed.), *The Oxford Annotated Apocrypha* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965), pp. 263–93.
- Kappler, W., 'De memoria alterius libri Maccabaeorum' (Ph.D. dissertation, Academia Georgia Augusta zu Göttingen, 1929).
- Maccabaeorum libri I–IV.1: Maccabaeorum liber I* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1936).
- Katz, P., 'Eleazar's Martyrdom: The Latin Evidence for a Point of the Story', in *Studia Patristica* 4.2 (TU 79; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1961), pp. 118–24.
- 'The Text of 2 Maccabees Reconsidered', *ZNW* 51 (1960), pp. 10–30.
- Kilpatrick, G.D., Review of Kappler 1936 and Hanhardt 1959 and 1961, *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* 215 (1963), pp. 10–24 [reprinted in S. Jellicoe (ed.), *Studies in the Septuagint: Origins, Recensions, and Interpretations* (New York: KTAV, 1974), pp. 418–30].
- Kolbe, W., *Beiträge zur syrischen und jüdischen Geschichte. Kritische Untersuchungen zur Seleukidenliste und zu den beiden ersten Makkabäerbüchern* (BWAT, Neue Folge 10; Berlin: W. Kohlhammer, 1926).
- Lévy, I., 'Les deux livres des Maccabées et le livre hébraïque des Hasmonéens', *Semitica* 5 (1955), pp. 15–39.
- Mayer, W., with B. Neil, *St. John Chrysostom: The Cult of the Saints* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2006).
- Metzger, B., *An Introduction to the Apocrypha* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1957).
- Metzger, B. (ed.), *The Oxford Annotated Apocrypha* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977).
- Meyer, E., *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, vol. II (Stuttgart: J.G. Cotta, 1921).
- Momigliano, A., *Prime linee di storia della tradizione maccabaica* (Turin: G. Chiantore, 1931; reprint, Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1968).
- 'The Second Book of Maccabees', *CP* 70 (1975), pp. 81–88.
- Mugler, C., 'Remarques sur le second livre des Macchabées', *RHPR* 11 (1931), pp. 419–23.
- Nestle, E., *Septuagintastudien* 4 (Stuttgart: Stuttgarter Vereins-Buchdruckerei, 1903).
- Nickelsburg, G.W.E., *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981).
- Niese, B., 'Kritik der beiden Makkabäerbücher nebst Beiträgen zur Geschichte der makkabäischen Erhebung', *Hermes* 35 (1900) pp. 268–307, 453–527.

- Pfeiffer, R.H., *History of New Testament Times with an Introduction to the Apocrypha* (New York: Harper, 1949).
- Rappaport, U., 'Nicanor', in *ABD*, vol. IV, p. 1105.
- Reynolds, L.D., and N.G. Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars: A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature* (3rd ed.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991).
- Richnow, W., 'Untersuchung zu Sprache und Stil des 2. Makkabäerbuches' (Ph.D. dissertation, Georg-August-Universität zu Göttingen, 1967).
- Risberg, B., 'Textkritische und exegetische Anmerkungen zu den Makkabäerbüchern', *Beiträge zur Religionswissenschaft* 2 (1915), pp. 6–31.
- Schaper, J., '2 Maccabees', in A. Pietersma and B.G. Wright (eds.), *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), pp. 501–20.
- Schunck, K.D., *Die Quellen des I. und II. Makkabäerbüchers* (Halle: Niemeyer, 1954).
- Schwartz, D., *2 Maccabees* (CEJL; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008).
- Smyth, H.W., *Greek Grammar* (rev. G.M. Messing; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1956).
- Stone, M.E. (ed.), *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (CRINT 2.II; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984).
- Tcherikover, V., *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1959).
- Torrey, C.C., 'The Letters Prefixed to Second Maccabees', *JAOS* 60 (1940), pp. 119–50.
- VanderKam, J.C., *An Introduction to Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001).
- Vinson, M., 'Gregory Nazianzen's Homily 15 and the Genesis of the Christian Cult of the Maccabean Martyrs', *Byzantion* 64 (1994), pp. 166–92.
- Wacholder, B.Z., 'The Letter from Judah Maccabee to Aristobulos: Is 2 Maccabees 1:10b–2:18 Authentic?' *HUCA* 49 (1978), pp. 89–133.
- Walbank, F.W., 'History and Tragedy', *Historia* 9 (1960), pp. 216–34.
- Walters, P. (formerly Katz), *The Text of the Septuagint: Its Corruptions and Their Emendations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973).
- Wellhausen, J., 'Über den geschichtlichen Wert des zweiten Makkabäerbuchs, im Verhältnis zum ersten', in *Nachrichten von der Königl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen* (Philosophisch-historische Klasse aus dem Jahre 1905; Göttingen: L. Horstmann), pp. 117–63.
- Wilhelm, A., 'Zu einigen Stellen der Bücher des Makkäbaer', *Anzeiger der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien* 74 (1937), pp. 15–30.
- Zambelli, M., 'La Composizione del secondo libro dei Maccabei e la nuova cronologia di Antioco IV Epifane', *Miscellanea Greca e Romana* (Studi pubblicati dall'Istituto per la Storia Antica 16; Rome, 1965), pp. 195–299.
- Zeitlin, S., and S. Tedesche, *The Second Book of Maccabees* (Dropsie College Edition of Jewish Apocryphal Literature; New York: Harper, 1954).

3 Maccabees

Sara Raup Johnson

Editions

(a) Standard Greek Editions

Göttingen, vol. IX.3, *Maccabaeorum liber III* (Hanhart, 1980; 2nd ed.).

Rahlfs-Hanhart, vol. I, pp. 1139–56.

Swete, vol. III, pp. 709–28.

(b) Other Greek Editions

3 Maccabees (Croy, 2006).¹

Third and Fourth Books of Maccabees (Hadas, 1953).²

(c) Modern Translations

NETS (Boyd-Taylor, 2007), pp. 521–29.³

LXX.D (Knöppler, 2009), pp. 717–29.

Bd'A 15.3 (Modrzejewski, 2008).

La Biblia Griega, vol. II (Fernández Marcos *et al.*, 2011), pp. 903–30.

I. General Characteristics

3 Maccabees is a pseudo-historical (apparently fictional) account of God's deliverance of the Jews of Alexandria from persecution at the hands of Ptolemy IV Philopator of Egypt, over fifty years before the

1. Greek text (based on Alexandrinus) and facing English translation, including introduction and separate running commentary.

2. Greek text (based on Rahlfs), translation, introduction, and commentary in the footnotes to the translation.

3. Other English translations with introductions can be found in, e.g., *APOT*, vol. I, and *OTP*, vol. II.

Maccabean revolt. It is universally regarded as an original Greek composition, not a translation of a text in any other language. The author is anonymous, but is presumed to have been a Greek-speaking Jew, most likely a resident of Alexandria. It was probably composed during either the last century of Ptolemaic rule or the first decades of Roman rule over Egypt (see § II and § III for further discussion).

The title, 3 Maccabees, is a misnomer. Unlike 1, 2 and 4 Maccabees, the narrative does not deal directly with the Maccabean revolt in any way. It may have acquired the label simply by being stored and later collocated with the other books of Maccabees in antiquity. Certainly, in the few ancient manuscripts in which it is preserved, it always follows 1 and 2 Maccabees (Emmet, ‘Third Book’, p. 155). However, there are important thematic similarities with the other books of Maccabees which may have led to the books being grouped together. Like them, 3 Maccabees deals with a persecution (albeit apparently a fictional one) in the Hellenistic period, and the narrative at points reflects knowledge of the Maccabean revolt. The author may be imaginatively re-casting a persecution similar to Antiochus IV’s persecution of Jerusalem in an Egyptian setting, just as the author of Judith seems to be re-imagining the assault of Nebuchadnezzar on the First Temple in a Second Temple setting.

Despite strong thematic and linguistic similarities with a number of other Septuagint books, it is not possible in most cases to establish with certainty whether the author of 3 Maccabees had direct knowledge of other books of the Septuagint (or whether others had direct knowledge of 3 Maccabees). One brief textual allusion suggests knowledge of the Greek translation of the additions to Daniel (specifically, the Prayer of Azariah; 3 Macc. 6.6, cf. *Song 3 Childr.* 27 [Prayer of Azariah 27 in the NRSV; Dan. 3.50 in LXX]). It is highly likely, but cannot be proven, that the author was acquainted with 2 Maccabees. It is possible that the Greek translation of Esther reflects knowledge of 3 Maccabees, particularly since the similarities between the texts are concentrated in the additions to Esther. Given the uncertainty about the date of composition for 3 Maccabees, however, some have also argued for influence in the reverse direction (that the author of 3 Maccabees knew and used a Greek translation of Esther).⁴

4. Motzo (‘Il rifacimento’) makes the strongest argument for Greek Esther’s direct use of 3 Maccabees in its reworking of the canonical book of Esther; likewise,

Outside the Septuagint, there are strong linguistic and thematic connections with the *Letter of Aristeas*, but again, direct influence in either direction cannot be proven. 3 Maccabees may most profitably be read as a product of the same late Hellenistic thought-world that yielded 2 Maccabees, the Greek translations of Daniel and Esther, and (outside the Septuagint) the *Letter of Aristeas*. On the relations of 3 Maccabees with other canonical and apocryphal books, see Croy, *3 Maccabees*, pp. xi–xiii, xiv–xvii; Johnson, *Historical Fictions*, pp. 129–31, 136–37; Anderson, ‘3 Maccabees’, pp. 512, 515–16; Hadas, *Third*, pp. 6–12; and Emmet, ‘Third Book’, pp. 156–59.

II. Time and Place of Composition

The precise date of composition remains controversial. The narrative takes place under Ptolemy IV Philopator (221–204 B.C.E.), and the author appears to regard the Temple as still standing, thus putting the outside limits at 217 B.C.E. (the Battle of Raphia, referenced in the narrative) and 70 C.E. The *terminus post quem*, however, is widely regarded as being the end of the second century B.C.E. (see Croy, *3 Maccabees*, p. xi; Modrzejewski, *Jews of Egypt*, p. 142; Johnson, *Historical Fictions*, pp. 130–31; Anderson, ‘3 Maccabees’, p. 512; Hadas, *Third*, pp. 18–19). The text appears to contain a verbal echo of the earliest Septuagint translation of Daniel (3 Macc. 6.6, *δροσίσας καμίνον*; cf. *Song 3 Childr. 27*, *πνεῦμα δρόσου*—both referring to the cooling wind which the angel of the Lord sent through the fiery furnace). Since the old Greek translation of Daniel was known to the translator of 1 Maccabees (ca. 100 B.C.E.), 3 Maccabees is unlikely to have been composed much before the end of the second century B.C.E. Stylistic

Hadas (*Third*, pp. 6–7) describes the relationship as ‘patent’. Hacham (‘3 Maccabees’) sees a relationship between the Additions and 3 Maccabees. Others who see this direction of influence as likely but not proven are Johnson (*Historical Fictions*, p. 13) and Barclay (*Jews*, p. 448). Collins (*Between Athens*, p. 123) argues for 3 Maccabees’ use of Esther. Croy (*3 Maccabees*, pp. xi–xii, xvi) reserves judgement on the question, and Anderson (‘3 Maccabees’, p. 515) also expresses scepticism that any direct relationship exists between the two.

similarities with 2 Maccabees and the *Letter of Aristeas* and with the epistolary formulae of the Ptolemaic court (§ IV) tend to point in the same direction. This would place the date of 3 Maccabees sometime in the last century of Ptolemaic rule (ca. 100–30 B.C.E.) or the early decades of Roman rule (30 B.C.E.–70 C.E.). However, there remains a strong difference of opinion between those who regard the text as Hellenistic/Ptolemaic and those who regard it as early Roman.

It has been suggested that the reference to a *λαογραφία* (a census for taxation) which the author clearly regards as degrading to the Jews must be understood as an allusion to the introduction of a similar *λαογραφία* under Augustus in 27 B.C.E. (This view was most strongly advocated by Hadas, *Third*, pp. 17–21 and Tcherikover, ‘Third Book’, pp. 12–18; those who have recently shown sympathy for the view include Barclay, *Jews*, p. 448 and Collins, *Between Athens*, pp. 124–25.) However, more recent research has shown that the term *λαογραφία* was already in use in the Hellenistic period to refer to a census applied to native Egyptians but not to Greeks. The reference could thus as easily be Hellenistic as Roman (Croy, *3 Maccabees*, p. xii; Johnson, *Historical Fictions*, pp. 134–36; Modrzejewski, *Jews*, pp. 81–83, 150; Anderson, ‘3 Maccabees’, p. 511; Wallace, ‘Census’, pp. 418–42). Likewise, the parallels which have been cited to the persecution of the Jews of Alexandria under Caligula (37–41 C.E.) are not sufficiently precise to compel us to date 3 Maccabees to the period of that crisis. The dating to the reign of Caligula was a popular theory in the nineteenth century and early twentieth century, most recently revived by Collins, *Between Athens*, pp. 124–25, but it has not won widespread support in recent scholarship (see Croy, *3 Maccabees*, pp. xii–xiii; Johnson, *Historical Fictions*, pp. 132–34; Anderson, ‘3 Maccabees’, pp. 511–12). There is thus nothing in the text which compels a Roman dating.

On the Hellenistic side, the literary affinities with texts dating primarily to the late second century or the first century B.C.E., the use of epistolary greeting formulae from the last century of Ptolemaic rule, and the absence of any explicit and undisputed reference to Roman rule have been cited as evidence in favour of a date prior to the Roman conquest of Egypt (Croy, *3 Maccabees*, p. xi; Johnson, *Historical Fictions*, pp. 136–37; Anderson, ‘3 Maccabees’, pp. 511–12; Hadas, *Third*, pp. 8–12;

Bickerman, 'Makkabäerbucher (III)', p. 798; Emmet, 'Third Book', pp. 155–57). However, these indicators likewise cannot be treated as decisive enough to rule out a Roman date. Lacking conclusive indicators within the text, the question comes down to a matter of interpretation by the reader.

The controversy over the date of the text is inextricably linked with the controversy over its interpretation (see § VI). It is generally acknowledged that the challenges faced by the Jews of Roman Egypt were greater than those faced by the Jews of Hellenistic Egypt. Under the Ptolemies, a number of Jews occupied positions of prominence in the government, and there are few, if any, documented examples of persecution or serious ethnic conflict between the Jews and their neighbours. Under Roman rule, the situation appears to have worsened. Under Augustus (27 B.C.E.), the Jews were subjected to a much-hated tax, the *λαογραφία*, which had previously been applied only to native Egyptians (i.e., non-Greeks). Under Caligula (38 C.E.), tensions in Alexandria culminated in one of the first pogroms in recorded Jewish history. Thus, arguments over the date of 3 Maccabees tend to focus on whether one thinks the text reflects an atmosphere of cooperation between Jews and Gentiles (Hellenistic), or one of crisis and confrontation (Roman). Since the narrative unquestionably contains both conciliatory and confrontational aspects, and since one can hardly rule out the possibility of a confrontational text being written in the late Ptolemaic period or a conciliatory text being composed under the Roman governors, the question of date must be regarded as open. One of the most recent commentators on the text (Croy, *3 Maccabees*, p. xiii) judiciously concludes that 'the date of composition could lie anywhere within the range of 100 BCE to 50 CE'.

Whether Hellenistic or Roman, there is no doubt that the author's chief interest lies with the Jews of Egypt, and the provenance is assumed to be Egypt, most likely Alexandria. The author's name is unknown; given the assumed provenance of the text, he was most likely a Jew living in Alexandria. His first language was clearly Greek (§ III), and both his style and his knowledge of history and court protocol suggest a high level of education.

III. Language

On the basis of the style, it is universally agreed that the work was composed in Greek, and there is no evidence that it was translated into Hebrew or Aramaic in antiquity, although there is a Syriac version in the Peshitta. The Greek is characteristic of the elaborate, artificial, pseudo-classicising style of the Atticists in late Hellenistic Alexandria (§ IV), with, however, many Koine elements mixed in (Anderson, ‘3 Maccabees’, p. 510; Emmet, ‘Third Book’, pp. 161–62). Emmet gives a list of classical forms that are rare or unattested elsewhere in the Septuagint (such as *τέλεος*, *δεσμός* and crasis with the article in *τὸὐναντίον* and *τὰληθές*), along with a list of words that are drawn from Koine.

The vocabulary is large and varied. Emmet (‘Third Book’, p. 161) identifies over one hundred words not found elsewhere in the Septuagint, along with no fewer than 20 adjectives compounded with the alpha privative, many words drawn from poetry (e.g., *πολύδακρυς* ‘much-wept, lamented’), and 14 *hapax legomena* (*μίσυβρις* ‘hating insolence’ being notable among them). Croy speculates that the author may have invented some of these coinages himself, and indeed he is extremely fond of compound verbs and adjectives. In terms of style and vocabulary, by far the closest analogue to the book can be found in 2 Maccabees, which has been characterised (perhaps with justice) as one of the best surviving representatives of the pathetic school of Hellenistic historiography (Doran, ‘2 Maccabees’). Emmet (‘Third Book’, pp. 156–57) gives an exhaustive list of the similarities. One such similarity between the two is their fondness for over-using the weak connective particle *δέ*, which the author of 3 Maccabees uses in 10 of his first 11 sentences (‘Third Book’, pp. 156, 161).

IV. Composition

There is no doubt that the author aspired to emulate the highest literary standards of his day, but his efforts have not drawn much praise from modern scholars. His style has been variously characterised as ‘obscure’ (Emmet, ‘Third Book’, p. 161), ‘verbose... florid... bombastic’ (Hadas, *Third*, p. 22), ‘pompous’ (Tcherikover, ‘Third Book’, pp. 1, 18), and

‘pretentious’ (Croy, *3 Maccabees*, p. xiv). Nevertheless, the author’s style is very much in keeping with that of his pseudo-Atticising peers (§ III). Hadas rightly observes: ‘Its precocity, it may be said, including the well-marked purple passages, is no worse than that of the run of “rhetoricians” of the Roman period’ (*Third*, p. 22). His style might well have been more pleasing to them than it is to us. It is with some justice that Croy (*3 Maccabees*, p. xiv) quotes Hadas (*Third*, p. 22): ‘If the stones in [the author’s] edifice are sometimes oddly chosen and over-curiously wrought, the structure as a whole is impressive’.

The author has a preference for elaborately constructed sentences, in which a relatively spare structure with a small number of finite verbs is expanded upon by piling up participial clauses, prepositional phrases, and literary epithets. This results in a style that is, at its best, rhetorically impressive; at its worst, painfully convoluted. Croy (*3 Maccabees*, p. xiv) notes the example of 3 Macc. 5.31, ‘when ten words intervene between the article “the” and its noun “Jews”’.

The author of 3 Maccabees demonstrates extensive familiarity with both the practices and the vocabulary of the Ptolemaic court, and his command of the bureaucratic style of the Ptolemaic chancery is striking, particularly in the allegedly genuine documents (royal decrees and letters). Here the author’s strongest literary affinities are with the author of the *Letter of Aristeas*, who likewise includes putatively genuine documents in his narrative (see Emmet, ‘Third Book’, p. 157 for a detailed catalogue of similarities between 3 Maccabees and the *Letter of Aristeas*, with a particular focus on the language of the official documents). A comparison with the papyrological evidence (Emmet, ‘Third Book’, pp. 157–58; Bickerman, ‘Makkabäerbücher [III]’, p. 798) shows that the author was imitating the style, not of Philopator’s day, but of his own day. This may strike us as incongruous, given the modern distaste for anachronism, but is characteristic of the approach to verisimilitude in ancient fictions (Johnson, *Historical Fictions*, pp. 139–40, 209–15).

V. Key Text-Critical Issues

3 Maccabees is found in only one of the three major uncial manuscripts of the Septuagint (Alexandrinus, mid-fifth century C.E.; it is not found in Vaticanus or Sinaiticus). Those who are particularly interested in the

text of the Alexandrinus, the oldest and presumably best witness to the ancient form of the text, may refer to Croy (*3 Maccabees*), which aims to present the text of the Alexandrinus in its original form with as little textual emendation as possible. The Venetus (an eighth-century uncial codex) can be used to correct and supplement the text preserved in the Alexandrinus. There are also 29 minuscule manuscripts which contain all or part of the text, and occasionally preserve useful readings. These include a less reliable corpus of minuscules, the so-called Lucianic Recension, which can be traced back to the revision of the Septuagint made by Lucian of Antioch (d. 312 C.E.). See, in addition to Hanhart (Göttingen), Croy, *3 Maccabees*, pp. x–xi, xxi–xxii; Anderson, ‘*3 Maccabees*’, pp. 509–10; and Hadas, *Third*, pp. 26–27.

Like 4 Maccabees, but unlike 1 and 2 Maccabees, 3 Maccabees was apparently not in the version of the Septuagint translated by Jerome into Latin (Vulgate, fourth century C.E.) and, thus, is not included among the Roman Catholic Deuterocanonical books or the Protestant Apocrypha (although it did remain part of the Eastern [Greek and Slavonic] Orthodox canon). It is traditionally classified by scholars among the pseudepigrapha.

Due to the fact that 3 Maccabees was omitted from the Vulgate, and since there is no evidence that it was read by Jews after the second century C.E., there are few witnesses in the form of ancient translations. There is a Syriac translation in the Peshitta (possibly fourth century C.E.) which tends to follow the Lucianic manuscript tradition, and an Armenian translation (ca. 400–600 C.E.), but since both translations are free adaptations, they are only occasionally useful as witnesses to the text.

Being an original Greek composition with few manuscript witnesses, the text presents relatively few text-critical problems. Many variant readings do not affect the sense at all, and those that do often simply substitute a more common expression for a difficult one. The author’s preference for a convoluted, obscure Greek style does seem in some cases to have resulted in textual corruption, rendering a few sentences unintelligible (Emmet, ‘Third Book’, p. 155). In these cases, reference may be made to the later witnesses and the ancient translations for clarification.

The most significant text-critical issue affecting the book is the question of whether the book has lost its original opening. In every surviving witness, the text begins at its present point, but some puzzling elements in the text as it now stands have led to speculation that the beginning may have been cut off. The narrative begins *in medias res*, with Ptolemy Philopator preparing for the battle of Raphia, receiving a report from ‘those who have returned’ (there is no mention of their having been sent out in the first place). There is little explanation to help the reader understand who the major figures are or what the historical context is. The next sentence refers to an earlier conspiracy as if the reader already knows about it (but, oddly, the leading conspirator is introduced as if we have not heard of him before). 3 Maccabees 2.25 refers to ‘the aforementioned drinking companions’, but in fact they have not been previously mentioned. Stylistically, the appearance of the postpositive particle $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ as the second word of the first sentence in the text is particularly odd, since $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ is usually used to connect a sentence to a preceding sentence.

A number of scholars (Croy, *3 Maccabees*; Parente, ‘Third Book’; Anderson, ‘3 Maccabees’; Tcherikover, ‘Third Book’; and Hadas, *Third*) have concluded that these peculiarities point to there being a strong likelihood that the beginning of the text was lost at an early point in its transmission, or alternatively, that the text has been clumsily excerpted from a longer narrative. However, this is not the only possible conclusion (Johnson, *Historical Fictions*, pp. 192–93). The technique of beginning a narrative *in medias res* was popular among ancient authors from Homer on down, and became a particularly favoured device among the later Greek novelists (for an extreme example, see Heliodorus’s *Ethiopika*). Although the fast-paced introduction may be disorienting for the reader, it is not in fact incoherent or unintelligible. All of the necessary information (the identities of the major historical figures, the historical circumstances of the battle) could be deduced by a reader who was familiar with the history of the Ptolemaic court, precisely the sort of reader to which the author elsewhere seems to be trying to appeal (see the section on language and style). In fact, the style of 3 Macc. 1.1-7 is strongly reminiscent of Hellenistic historiography, rather unlike the style of the

narrative that follows, and if this section has not been excerpted from a lost historian outright (which has indeed been suggested), it is highly likely that the author is imitating Polybius or another similar historian, and inviting the reader to consult their own knowledge of such historical writers (Johnson, *Historical Fictions*, pp. 190–209).

Even the linguistic oddities may be explained along the same lines. Using *δέ* in the first line of a text is unusual in Greek, but it is not unparalleled, and the author is in fact extraordinarily fond of the particle *δέ* and other similar connectives (see Croy, *3 Maccabees*, p. xiv). While the reference to ‘the aforementioned drinking companions’ is certainly odd, the drinking companions in question were in fact notorious in the historical sources for Philopator’s reign, and Polybius in particular is fond of variations on the word ‘aforementioned’, making it a possible allusion to a certain historiographical literary style. Some support for the argument that the author’s literary peculiarities are products of his own style rather than products of clumsy editing or accidental amputation may be found in the curious description in 3 Macc. 1.2 of ‘a *certain* Theodotus’ who intends to carry out ‘*the* plot’. While the use of the definite article to refer to the plot might seem to suggest that the plot has already been mentioned, the reference to *Θεόδοτος δέ τις* cannot mean anything except that the reader has not, in fact, been introduced to this conspirator and his plot before. A version of this plot is attested in Polybius (5.81), in which we discover that Theodotus was not in fact an obscure courtier (as the author of 3 Maccabees seems to imply), but a major figure at the Ptolemaic court who betrayed Philopator and went over to the Seleucid side two years before the battle of Raphia. His name would have been quite well known to a reader who was familiar with the reign of Philopator. Thus, it seems possible that the curious wording here is an (admittedly peculiar) attempt by the author coyly to refer to events with which his best-educated readers would have already been familiar. Nevertheless, the possibility of textual mutilation and/or poor editing on the part of the original author remains an attractive explanation to many scholars (see, most recently, Croy, *3 Maccabees*, p. xviii) and cannot be entirely ruled out.

VI. Ideology and Exegesis

There tends to be a significant difference in interpretation between those who see the text as Roman and those who see it as Hellenistic. Those who see the text as Roman stress the elements in the story which depict the Jews as a persecuted minority, tormented by the cruel king, hated by their enemies, bitterly hostile towards apostates in their own community. Those who view the text as Hellenistic stress the possibilities for peaceful compromise found in the story, wherein the Jews prove themselves faithful, their enemies are confounded, the king is reformed, and the Jews are restored to favour. Both interpretations are possible, and ultimately readers must decide for themselves whether the text works more effectively as a model for life in a time of cooperation and compromise, or life in a time of crisis and conflict. In either case, heavy stress is laid on the importance of maintaining a life of integrity and fidelity to God's Law.

Both scholarly interpretations of the text would generally agree on two things: cooperation between the Jews and their gentile neighbours, however attractive it might be, is permissible only within set limits that do not violate the Law, and apostasy (as it is understood by the author of the text) is utterly unacceptable as a solution to the challenges of maintaining a distinctive Jewish identity under a non-Jewish governing authority. Like a number of other Second Temple Jewish texts, such as *Esther*, *Daniel*, the *Letter of Aristeas* and *2 Maccabees*, it can thus be understood as a guide to life in the Diaspora, at a time when the Temple was still standing but many Jews lived and often prospered outside the Land.

Like many Second Temple Jewish texts, particularly those written in Greek, *3 Maccabees* has long raised perplexing problems for those who seek to treat it as an historical source. The text can certainly be treated as a source for understanding the cultural identity and ideological outlook of Second Temple Jews in the Egyptian diaspora (though, as we have seen, scholars may differ on the conclusions that they draw about the precise date and ideological orientation of the text). It is more difficult to identify with confidence any 'historical kernel' in the narrative itself.

With very few exceptions (the most notable recent exception being Kasher, *Jews*), scholars have long since ceased to regard the text as evidence of an actual persecution in the time of Ptolemy Philopator.

However, many scholars are willing to contemplate the possibility that it can be traced back to an historical persecution at some other period of Ptolemaic rule. Josephus (*Apion* 2.53-55) reports a similar (but not identical) incident, in which the Jews of Alexandria were gathered into the hippodrome and prepared for elephantine extinction, only to be spared at the eleventh hour. Josephus, however, places the incident in a different historical context, that of the civil war between Ptolemy VIII Physcon and Cleopatra II in 145 B.C.E. Both Josephus and 3 Maccabees claim to be explaining the origin of a festival celebrated by the Jews of Alexandria in their own time. Since the political context in which Josephus places the story is, on the surface, more plausible than the scenario envisioned by the author of 3 Maccabees, it has often been claimed that Josephus preserves the ‘true’ origin of the festival. However, the version reported by Josephus is as sensational and as ideologically coloured as the version in 3 Maccabees, and he records it, not in his more scholarly historical narrative, the *Jewish Antiquities*, but in the highly rhetorical context of the speech against Apion. There is simply not enough evidence to connect the persecution of 3 Maccabees with any historical persecution of the Jews of Alexandria in the Hellenistic period. We cannot even prove that any persecution ever took place in Egypt before the end of the Ptolemaic era. As in the case of the festival of Purim associated with the story of Esther, it is not now possible to explain what gave rise to the elephant festival celebrated by the Jews of Alexandria. Like Esther, like Daniel, and indeed like the much older narrative of the Exodus from Egypt, it is probably better understood as a perennial fable about the uncertainties of life under foreign rule.

VII. Reception History

There is no undisputed evidence of 3 Maccabees being cited by any contemporary Second Temple Jewish author (the strongest evidence might be in the case of Greek Esther, as discussed above, but even that case cannot be regarded as proven). There are occasional allusions to the book in a few early Christian authors, exclusively to be found in the eastern half of the empire, and the only ancient translations of the book

(Syriac and Armenian) were likewise products of Eastern Christianity. There are primarily lists of canonical books, in some of which 3 Maccabees is only indirectly attested by reference to a fourth book of Maccabees. Emmet ('Third Book', p. 162) contains the most detailed list of early Christian references (see further Croy, *3 Maccabees*, p. xx; Parente, 'Third Book', pp. 144–45; Revised Schürer, pp. 540–41; Anderson, '3 Maccabees', p. 516; and Hadas, *Third*, p. 26). 3 Maccabees was never translated into Latin, and there is no trace of influence in the Western half of the empire or in later Western art and literature. The book has continued to be read by Greek and Slavonic Orthodox Christians down to the modern day, as it is included within the Eastern Orthodox canon. There is no evidence at all that the book was read by Jews after the second century C.E.

Bibliography

- Anderson, H. (ed. and trans.), '3 Maccabees', in *OTP*, vol. II, pp. 509–29.
- Attridge, H.W., et al. (eds.), *The HarperCollins Study Bible: Fully Revised and Updated* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006).
- Barclay, J.M.G., *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE–117 CE)* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996).
- Bickerman, E., 'Makkabäerbücher (III)', in *PW* XIV (1928), cols. 797–800.
- Collins, J.J., '3 Maccabees', in H.W. Attridge (ed.), *The HarperCollins Study Bible, Fully Revised and Updated* (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 2006), pp. 1573–1587.
- Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora* (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000).
- Coogan, M.D., et al., *The New Oxford Annotated Bible: New Revised Standard Version, with the Apocrypha* (4th ed.; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).
- Cousland, J.R.C., 'Reversal, Recidivism and Reward in 3 Maccabees: Structure and Purpose', *JSJ* 34 (2003), pp. 39–51.
- Croy, N.C., *3 Maccabees* (Septuagint Commentary Series; Leiden: Brill, 2006).
- Doran, R., '2 Maccabees and "Tragic History"', *HUCA* 50 (1979), pp. 107–14.
- Emmet, C.W., 'The Third Book of Maccabees', in *APOT*, vol. I, pp. 155–73.
- Hacham, N., '3 Maccabees and Esther: Parallels, Intertextuality, and Diaspora Identity', *JBL* 126 (2007), pp. 765–85.
- Hadas, M. (ed. and trans.), *The Third and Fourth Books of Maccabees* (New York: Harper, 1953).
- Hanhart, R. (ed.), *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum*. Vol. IX.3, *Maccabaeorum liber III* (2nd ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980 [1960]).

- Johnson, S.R., *Historical Fictions and Hellenistic Jewish Identity: Third Maccabees in Its Cultural Context* (Hellenistic Culture and Society 43; Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004).
- Kasher, A., *The Jews in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt* (TSAJ 7; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1985).
- Modrzejewski, J.M., *The Jews of Egypt: From Rameses II to Emperor Hadrian* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society, 1995).
- Modrzejewski, J.M., (ed.), *La Bible d'Alexandrie*. Vol. XV, *Troisième livre des Maccabées* (Paris: Cerf, 2008).
- Motzo, B., 'Il rifacimento greco del "Ester" e il "III Macc"', in *Saggi di storia e letteratura giudeo-ellenistica* (Florence: F. Le Monnier, 1924), pp. 272–90.
- Parente, F., 'The Third Book of Maccabees as Ideological Document and Historical Source', *Henoah* 10 (1988), pp. 143–82.
- Tcherikover, V.A., 'The Third Book of Maccabees as a Historical Source of Augustus' Time', *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 7 (1961), pp. 1–26.
- Tromp, J., 'The Formation of the Third Book of Maccabees', *Henoah* 17 (1995), pp. 311–28.
- Wallace, S.L., 'Census and Poll-Tax in Ptolemaic Egypt', *AJP* 59 (1938), pp. 418–42.
- Wills, L.M., *The Jewish Novel in the Ancient World* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1995).

4 Maccabees

Robert J.V. Hiebert

Editions

(a) Standard Greek Editions

- Göttingen, vol. IX.4, *Maccabaeorum liber IV* (Hiebert, forthcoming).
- Rahlfs-Hanhart, vol. I, pp. 1157–84.
- Swete, vol. III, pp. 729–62.

(b) Other Editions

- Quarto libro dei Maccabei* (Scarpata, 2006).
- 4. Makkabäerbuch* (Klauck, 1989).
- Third and Fourth Books of Maccabees* (Hadas, 1953).
- Le quatrième livre des Machabées* (Dupont-Sommer, 1939).
- ‘Das vierte Makkabäerbuch’ (Deissmann, 1900).
- The Fourth Book of Maccabees* (Syriac; Bensly and Barnes, 1895).
- ‘ΜΑΚΚΑΒΑΙΩΝ ΤΕΤΑΡΤΟΣ’ (Fritzsche, 1871).
- ‘Viertes Buch der Maccabäer’ (Grimm, 1851–60).

(c) Modern Translations

- NETS (Westerholm, 2007), pp. 530–41.
- LXX.D (Klauck, 2009), pp. 730–46.
- La Biblia Griega*, vol. II (Fernández Marcos *et al.*, 2011), pp. 931–74.

I. General Characteristics

The story of the Maccabean martyrs is well-known in early Jewish and Christian traditions. An account of the martyrdoms of a Jewish scribe (γραμματεὺς) named Eleazar and of seven brothers and their mother during the reign of the Seleucid king, Antiochus IV, is chronicled in

2 Macc. 6.18–7.42. That narrative appears to be the basis of a considerably expanded version of events in 4 Maccabees, a philosophical and theological treatise in which Eleazar—identified as a priest (ἱερεὺς) and lawyer (νομικός) in 5.4—and his heroic compatriots serve as prime examples of the author’s central thesis that pious reason masters the passions (1.1-9). The writing style of this original Greek composition reflects the author’s mastery of the Greek language. He employs an extensive vocabulary that includes a good number of neologisms, he fashions refined syntax, and he creates vivid metaphors and similes. His use of extravagant rhetoric and florid prose is presumably intended to arouse pity for the martyrs and to motivate readers to emulate their piety. The more than 70 extant Greek manuscripts and the early translations of 4 Maccabees as well as its citation in the orations and writings of early Christian luminaries all attest to the fact that this composition enjoyed considerable popularity in antiquity.

II. Time and Place of Composition

Questions concerning the authorship, provenance, and date of writing of 4 Maccabees persist because nothing explicit is said regarding these matters in this treatise. Eusebius (*Hist.* 3.10.6) and Jerome (*Vir.* III. 13) attribute 4 Maccabees to Josephus, a tradition that is perpetuated in the superscriptions and/or postscripts of some textual witnesses: *L*²³⁶ *q*^{-370c}
³⁰⁰² *q1* 747 *m*⁻⁴⁷³ 686(714*(inc)) 455^c *m2* 62 58 340 577 668 741 Sy^{BC} *a-f*. Josephan authorship is, however, implausible for a number of reasons. Both with regard to writing style and to political and theological perspectives, Josephus differs from the author of 4 Maccabees. For example, it seems highly unlikely that Josephus—who portrays the Romans as compassionate opponents during the Jewish War of 66–73 C.E., for which he holds seditious rebels to blame, who is ultimately granted Roman citizenship, and who lives under Flavian patronage—would eulogise so extravagantly those who, according to the author of 4 Maccabees, rejected even the appearance of compromise with their Hellenistic overlord, Antiochus, for the sake of scrupulous observance of the tenets of their faith. Another indication that Josephus is not the author of 4 Maccabees has to do with the rendering of names. 4 Maccabees often opts for indeclinable Greek transliterations of Hebrew names

(e.g., Ἰωσήφ [2.2], Δαθάν [2.17], Ἀβειρών [2.17], Ἰακώβ [2.19], Δαυίδ [3.7]), whereas Josephus chooses Greek declinable forms (e.g., Ἰώσηπος [Ant. 2.54], Δαθάμης [Ant. 4.37], Ἀβίραμος [Ant. 4.37], Ἰάκωβος [Ant. 1.338], Δαυίδης [Ant. 7.312]). Finally, comparing the two with regard to the historical accuracy of their work, Josephus knows, for example, that Antiochus IV Epiphanes and Seleucus IV Philopator are brothers (Ant. 12.234) whereas the author of 4 Maccabees mistakenly says that Antiochus is the son of Seleucus (4.15). The writer of this philosophical treatise, therefore, remains anonymous, though he appears to have been a Torah-faithful Jew who was influenced as well by Hellenistic philosophy, and who was skilled in the use of the Greek language and rhetoric.

With regard to the provenance of this work, the locations that have received the most attention in scholarly discussion are Alexandria, Jerusalem, Antioch of Syria, and the territory of Asia Minor. The majority of scholars favour a northern location over Egypt or Judaea, citing evidence such as the existence by perhaps the fourth century of a cult of the Maccabean martyrs in Antioch where their relics were purportedly located, or the greater similarity between funerary texts in Asia Minor and a proposed tomb inscription in 4 Maccabees than such epitaphs elsewhere: for example, ἐνθάδε καικήδευτε [*sic*] ‘Here is buried...’ (MAMA 7, no. 582); Ἐνταῦθα...ἐγκεκήδευνται ‘Here lie buried...’ (4 Macc. 17.9 [all LXX quotations are from NETS]).

There is an ongoing debate regarding the date of writing for 4 Maccabees, with possibilities in the first or second centuries C.E. being suggested. Various arguments for a later date have been put forward, including the assertion that 4 Maccabees reflects a post-Second Temple context because it contains fewer references to the Temple and sacrificial cult than are found in its primary source, 2 Maccabees. A diminished interest in the Jerusalem cult could, however, just as well be due to the fact that 4 Maccabees, apparently unlike 2 Maccabees, seems to have originated in the Diaspora, rather than that it was written sometime after the destruction of the Temple. It has also been proposed that the philosophical eclecticism of the 4 Maccabees author that is manifested in his articulation of Platonic, Peripatetic, and Stoic ideas is characteristic of the so-called Second Sophistic that flourished in the late first and the second century, though it must be acknowledged that such eclecticism is

attested earlier in the first century as well. Other rationales for a later date based on vocabulary usage and on comparisons between 4 Maccabees and both the New Testament and the apostolic fathers are, like the preceding ones, inconclusive inasmuch as the data cited may also be interpreted to support an earlier date.

Bickerman has suggested that 4 Macc. 4.2 provides literary-historical evidence for a window of time between about 18 and 55 C.E. when the book could have been written. In that passage Apollonius is said to be the *στρατηγός* of Syria, Phoenicia, and Cilicia. This stands in contrast to an earlier description of Apollonius's administrative responsibilities in 2 Macc. 3.5, where he is called the *στρατηγός* of 'Coele-Syria and Phoenicia' with no mention of Cilicia. A number of ancient sources indicate, however, that Syria and Cilicia were under the jurisdiction of a single governor for a longer period than Bickerman has proposed, namely ca. 18–72 C.E. (*IGR* I, 445; Tacitus, *Ann.* 2.58; 6.31; 13.8; Columella, *Re rust.* 2.10.18; Gal. 1.21; Acts 15.23; Suetonius, *Div. Vesp.* 8.4). Moreover, some scholars assert that 4 Macc. 4.2 in fact only provides the book's *terminus post quem* inasmuch, it could have been written after Syria and Cilicia were no longer administratively linked. While this is a possibility, the data from the diverse sources cited above provide a rather compelling basis upon which to posit 72 C.E. as the *terminus ante quem*.

Related to the problem of determining the regions under Apollonius's administrative oversight is the question of the meaning of the term *στρατηγός*. One suggestion is that the term denotes 'general', that Apollonius is to be regarded as an officer who has only military responsibility for this region, and that this passage does not point unequivocally to sometime in the middle decades of the first century because it is not certain that the author of 4 Maccabees has the jurisdictional situation that obtained during that period in mind. The line of argumentation that seems to account best for all the available data, however, is that the term means 'governor', that the territorial reference is to a Roman provincial district over which Apollonius presides, and that the author of 4 Maccabees has intentionally altered the description found in 2 Maccabees to reflect geo-political realities in his own day.

III. Language

The writing style and compositional technique of the author of 4 Maccabees reflects his facility with the Greek language. An indication of the extensiveness and distinctiveness of the vocabulary that he employs is the fact that more than one-quarter of the words in the book (excluding 54 proper names) do not occur elsewhere in the Septuagint, and more than one-third are not found in the canonical books. The list of neologisms that he creates—typically compounds—includes ἀδελφοπρεπῶς ‘worthy of brothers’ (10.12), ἀλλοφυλέω ‘become an allophyle’ (18.5), ἀσθενόψυχος ‘of tender spirit’ (15.5), δειλόψυχος ‘fainthearted’ (8.16; 16.5), ἔθνηδόν ‘as an entire people’ (2.19), ἔθνόπληθος ‘throng of people’ (7.11), ἐκμελίζω ‘dismember’ (10.5, 8; 11.10), ἐκπολιτεύω ‘alter the form of government’ (4.19), ἐκριζωτής ‘uprooter’ (3.5), ἐννοσσοποιέομαι ‘build a nest’ (14.16), ἐπικαρπολογέομαι ‘glean’ (2.9), ἑπταμήτωρ ‘mother of seven’ (16.24), ἱερόψυχος ‘holy-minded’ (17.4), ἰσάστερος ‘star-like’ (17.5), κηρογονία ‘making of honeycombs’ (14.19), κοσμοπληθής ‘filling the world’ (15.31), κοσμοφορέω ‘sustain the world’ (15.31), μαλακοψυχέω ‘play the coward’ (6.17), μιαιοφαγία ‘eating of defiling foods’ (5.27; 6.19; 7.6; 11.25), ὁμοζηλία ‘common zeal’ (13.25), παθοκράτεια ‘control of passion’ (13.5, 16), περιχαλάω ‘relax’ (7.13), πρόκρημος ‘jutting’ (7.5), προσεπικατατείνω ‘tighten further’ (9.19), and τροχιαῖος ‘circular’ (11.10). He also uses a considerable variety of terms having to do with torture, both the instruments involved and the ways of inflicting it.

The frequent occurrence of optatives—some 46 in total—is an indication of the author’s syntactical sophistication. This stands in contrast to the decline of the use of the optative in the post-classical period in both literature and the common vernacular. In the New Testament, for example, it is virtually absent, apart from the writings of Paul and Luke where it tends to be found in certain types of constructions (for example, 14 of the 31 occurrences in the traditional Pauline corpus involve the expression *μή γένοιτο*; of the 28 occurrences in Luke-Acts, 11 are the form *εἴη*).

IV. Translation and Composition

The detailed and explicit nature of the descriptions in the book, drawing upon a wide range of vocabulary (§ III), is undoubtedly part of the author's rhetorical strategy to evoke sympathy for the martyrs as they exhibit unflinching and even cheerful resolve in withstanding the agonies that they endure for the sake of their faith and traditions. The book's grandiloquence is also reflected in the author's fondness for figures of speech such as apostrophe ('O aged man, more powerful than tortures, O elder, fiercer than fire, O supreme king over passions, Eleazar!', 7.10) and prosopopoeia ('Consider this also: if the woman, although a mother, had been fainthearted, she would have mourned over them and perhaps spoken as follows: "O how wretched I am, thrice unhappy time and again; though I bore seven boys, I have become a mother of none"', 16.5-6]).

The vivid metaphors and similes in 4 Maccabees are the result of comparisons involving horticulture (1.28-29), animal attack (9.28), animal nurture (14.13-20), athletics (6.10-11; 11.20-21; 13.15; 15.29; 16.16; 17.11-16; 18.23), sailing (7.1-3), siege warfare (7.4), natural and man-made structures that can withstand storms or earthquakes (7.5; 13.6-7, 13; 17.3), politics (15.25-28), and theatrical and musical arts (8.4; 13.8-18; 14.3-8; 15.21; 18.23).

Scholars have expressed various opinions regarding the literary genre of 4 Maccabees. In the final analysis there are parallels to several of categories of discourse (diatribe, encomium, funeral oration, protreptic address). The book's structure may be analysed in terms of the following components:

- 1) Exordium: articulation of the author's thesis (1.1-12).
- 2) Definition of philosophical terms and explication of relationships among them (1.13-30a).
- 3) Demonstration of the thesis by means of examples from Scripture (1.30b-3.18).
- 4) Further demonstration of the thesis by means of the example of the Maccabean martyrs (3.19-17.6).
- 5) Peroratio: recapitulation of the martyrs' victorious accomplishments, exhortation to emulate their virtue and piety, description of their vindication and the tyrant's ultimate vanquishment, and a concluding doxology (17.7-18.24).

V. Key Text-Critical Issues

Printed editions of Greek 4 Maccabees began to appear as early as 1526, though these were typically based on only one or, in some cases, two manuscripts. The first stage in the process leading toward the creation of a critical text came with the publication of Fritzsche's edition of the Septuagint in 1871. His version of 4 Maccabees is based primarily on the uncial codices Alexandrinus (A) and Sinaiticus (S), though reference is made to a dozen more manuscripts in the introduction to this book, and variant readings from most of those are recorded in the apparatus. In 1894, Swete published his first edition of the Septuagint, the third volume of which contains 4 Maccabees. This version of the book is a diplomatic edition that features the A text, but for which Swete has also recorded variant readings from S and an eighth- or ninth-century uncial codex, Venetus (V). The current standard edition of 4 Maccabees appeared in Rahlfs' edition of the Septuagint published in 1935. It contains an eclectic text of the book that is based on A and S, with an apparatus of substantive variants to the text in those manuscripts as well as some of the ones in V. It is Rahlfs' text that is reproduced in the volume by Hadas (*Third and Fourth Books*), who also provides an English translation. Scarpit (*Quarto libro*) supplies an Italian translation and commentary on 4 Maccabees to go with the Greek text which is, for the most part, that of Rahlfs, except for 30 alternative readings, a few of which are conjectural emendations without extant manuscript support. DeSilva's commentary is based on the S text of 4 Maccabees (*4 Maccabees: Introduction and Commentary*), an edited and annotated version of which he supplies. Klauck's German translation of 4 Maccabees (*4. Makkabäerbuch*), prepared in consultation with Hanhart, reflects the advances in knowledge about the textual history of the book gained as a result of the collations of the extant Greek manuscripts carried out at the Septuaginta-Unternehmen in Göttingen. The work of Klauck and Hanhart has led to the preliminary grouping of manuscript witnesses to the Greek text which the present writer, who is preparing the critical edition of the book for the Göttingen Septuaginta series, has modified in the light of his analysis of the manuscript evidence. Such groupings are, of course, based on patterns of agreement among witnesses in places where they diverge from the text that is judged to be original. The

uncials are among the most reliable witnesses to the original text of 4 Maccabees. When they do not attest the original text, however, they usually diverge from one another. Consequently, they do not constitute a manuscript group per se.

The Syriac version (Sy) of 4 Maccabees is the only fully extant translation of this work. The edition of Bensly and Barnes, published in 1895, features an eclectic text based on nine manuscripts. The style of this translation is relatively free, so it can at times be difficult if not impossible to identify the specific text type of its Greek *Vorlage*. When the Syriac version diverges from the original text, it does not exhibit significant affiliation with any of the Greek manuscripts or manuscript groups.

An anonymous Syriac composition described as a *memra* on the Maccabees is, according to Peterson, of significance for understanding the literary history of 4 Maccabees. It is her contention that this rhymed homily, which she calls 6 Maccabees, served as a source, as did 2 Maccabees 6–7, for 4 Maccabees. Her argument is based on comparisons among the three regarding different details in the Maccabean martyr stories that appear independently in 2 and 6 Maccabees but that are combined in 4 Maccabees. Thus, for example, while uttering his final words, Eleazar, in 2 Macc. 6.30, acknowledges that he could have been spared from death, but he has endured suffering because he fears the Lord; in 6 Macc. 127–130 he yields his tortured body and blood to God for the redemption of his compatriots; in 4 Macc. 6.27–29 he both admits that he could have saved himself but has chosen not to ‘for the sake of the law’, and entreats God, ‘Be merciful to your people, and be satisfied with our punishment on their behalf. Make my blood their purification, and take my life in exchange for theirs.’ Peterson’s thesis raises interesting source-critical questions that warrant further consideration as the relationships among the various accounts of these martyr stories continue to be investigated.

As for other translations, Klauck speaks of *Hinweise* of Coptic and Slavic versions, and Lucchesi reports on the existence of Coptic fragments (see Miroshnikov, ‘Sahidic’, for fragments containing portions of chs. 1, 15, 16, 17, 18). There is, in addition, a fourth-century Latin composition entitled *Passio Sanctorum Machabaeorum* that was inspired by 4 Maccabees. Heinrich Dörrie’s 1938 edition of *Passio*, for which

39 manuscripts were collated, was prepared with a view to laying the groundwork for the Greek critical edition of 4 Maccabees in the Göttingen Septuaginta series. Since *Passio* is, in reality, more of a free adaptation than a translation of 4 Maccabees, it is of little text-critical significance for the forthcoming Göttingen edition. The extent to which *Passio* and 4 Maccabees differ from one another is already evident when one compares the first verse of both:

Principium meum philosophico quidem sermone, sed christiano explicabitur sensu.

Φιλοσοφώτατον λόγον ἐπιδείκνυσθαι μέλλων, εἰ αὐτοδέσποτός ἐστιν τῶν παθῶν ὁ εὐσεβῆς λογισμός, συμβουλεύσαιμ' ἂν ὑμῖν ὀρθῶς ὅπως προσέχητε προθύμως τῇ φιλοσοφίᾳ.

Since I am about to discuss an eminently philosophical subject—whether pious reason is absolute master of the passions—I would duly advise you to attend diligently to the philosophy here set forth.

Passio does, however, provide an interesting glimpse into the early reception history of the Maccabean martyr story.

As well as the forthcoming critical edition for the Göttingen Septuaginta series, a commentary volume in the Society of Biblical Literature Commentary on the Septuagint (SBLCS) series is also planned. This undertaking will focus on elucidating the meaning of the text at the point of its production and will be based on the text of the above-mentioned critical edition. It will therefore provide a perspective that differs from that of deSilva's commentary which, as noted above, is based on the fourth-century S text that is part of the reception history of 4 Maccabees.

VI. Ideology and Exegesis

In support of the contention that pious reason (ὁ εὐσεβῆς λογισμός) masters the passions/emotions (τὰ πάθη), the author of 4 Maccabees focuses in chs. 5–18 on the example of faithful piety and perseverance set by the Maccabean martyrs. Resisting the natural instinct for survival, they died after having endured the barbarous cruelty of King Antiochus and his henchmen who tried to induce them to change their 'mode of living' and embrace 'a Greek way of life' (8.8)—a clear sign of which

would be ‘to taste pork and food sacrificed to idols’ (5.2). By staying true to their convictions, they ‘countered the tyrant with their own philosophy and by their good sense overthrew his tyranny’ (8.15). These martyrs are not, however, the only ones cited for having overcome natural human emotions for the sake of loyalty to God. The roster of heroes of faith includes Ioseph (2.2-3; 18.11), Moyses (2.17), Iakob (2.19-20), Dauid (3.6-18), Isaak (7.13-14; 16.20; 18.11), Abraam (16.19-20), Daniel, Hananias, Azarias, and Misael (16.21; 18.12-13).

The author of 4 Maccabees shares with writers such as Philo (*Op. Mund.* 134-138; *Leg. All.* 1.105-108; 3.42-43; *Rer. Div. Her.* 184-185) and the author of 1 Enoch (103.3; 104.1-3) a belief in the immortality of the soul (14.5-6; 16.13; 18.23). He gives no clear evidence, however, of supporting the idea of a resurrection that is reflected in a passage such as 2 Macc. 7.7-14 (cf. 4 Macc. 9.26–10.21).

There is perhaps some irony in the fact that the kind of philosophy that the author of 4 Maccabees espouses represents a confluence of Greek thought and Jewish theology. This is evident in the following citation in which reason, wisdom, and the four cardinal virtues articulated by Plato, on the one hand, and instruction in the Torah, on the other, are linked.

Reason (λογισμός), then, is the mind preferring, with sound judgement (ὀρθὸς λόγος), the life of wisdom (σοφία). Wisdom, in turn, is the knowledge of things divine and human and of the causes of these. It amounts, moreover, to training in the law (ἡ τοῦ νόμου παιδεία), training by which we learn divine matters reverently and human matters advantageously. Now the kinds of wisdom are prudence (φρόνησις), justice (δικαιοσύνη), courage (ἀνδρεία) and self-control (σωφροσύνη). Supreme over all of these is prudence (φρόνησις) by which in fact reason (λογισμός) prevails over the passions (τὰ πάθη). (1.15-19)

VII. Reception History

It appears as though 4 Maccabees was more influential in early Christianity than in post-Second Temple Judaism. The stories of the Maccabean era, including those of the martyrdoms recounted in this treatise, were of course well known in Jewish tradition, though the version of these events recorded in 2 Maccabees seems to have had more currency.

Whether one opts for an earlier or a later date for 4 Maccabees, there are clear lexical and theological parallels between it and the New Testament documents. This is the case particularly with regard to the characterisation of the deaths of the martyrs as having expiatory and purificatory efficacy for their nation, on the one hand, and the portrayal of the death of Jesus as having similar significance, on the other hand (e.g., note the use of ἱλαστήριον in 4 Macc. 17.22 [‘propitiatory’ (NETS)] and Rom. 3.25 [‘sacrifice of atonement’ (NRSV)]). Likewise, the emphasis on mastering the passions through self-control (σωφροσύνη) in 4 Maccabees (1.6, 30-31) finds its counterpart in exhortations to exercise that kind of self-control in certain New Testament epistles (e.g., Titus 2.5 [σώφρων], 6 [σωφρονέω], 12 [σωφρόνως]). It is evident as well that piety is an important theme for both the author of 4 Maccabees, who uses the term εὐσεβεία 46 times, and the authors of the Pastoral Epistles (1 Tim. 2.2; 3.16; 4.7, 8; 6.3, 5, 6, 11; 2 Tim. 3.5; Titus 1.1) and 2 Peter (1.3, 6, 7; 3.11). The only other place in the New Testament where this term occurs is Acts 3.12. Furthermore, endurance in persecution to the point of death because of loyalty to God is a theme common to both 4 Maccabees (e.g., 1.11; 9.29-30; 17.17-18) and the book of Revelation (1.9; 2.3; 12.10-11; 13.10).

Similarities can also be seen between 4 Maccabees and Christian martyrologies such as those celebrating the triumphs of Polycarp, Carpus, Papyrus, Agathonice, Perpetua, Felicitas, and the martyrs of Lyons. One observes the same kinds of attempts to induce the faithful to recant—whether by promises of advancement, threats, or infliction of gruesome torture—and their unflinching resolve to remain steadfast. Some scholars, in fact, maintain that 4 Maccabees served as a template for the authors who memorialised subsequent Christian martyrs.

The influence of 4 Maccabees is undeniably evident in the orations and writings of church fathers such as Origen (*Exhortatio ad martyrium*), Gregory of Nazianzus (*In Machabaeorum laudem*), John Chrysostom (*De Maccabeis*, *De Eleazaro et septem pueris*), and Ambrose (*De officiis minoribus*, *De Jacob et vita beata*). It is remarkable the degree to which the protagonists in 4 Maccabees are, in fact, adopted as Christian martyrs in some of these texts and in *Passio*, which associates them with ‘fortes milites Christi’ (1.9).

Bibliography

- Bensly, R.L., and W.E. Barnes (eds.), *The Fourth Book of Maccabees and Kindred Documents in Syriac* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1895).
- Bickerman, E.J., 'The Date of Fourth Maccabees', in *Studies in Jewish and Christian History: A New Edition in English* (AGJU 9/1-3; Leiden: Brill, 2007), pp. 266–71.
- 'Syria and Cilicia', *AJP* 68 (1947), pp. 353–62.
- Breitenstein, U., *Beobachtungen zu Sprache, Stil und Gedankengut der Vierten Makkabäerbuchs* (Basel: Schwabe, 1976).
- Calder, W.M. (ed.), *Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua*. Vol. VII, *Monuments from Eastern Phrygia* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1956).
- Campbell, D.A., 'Appendix 3: The Date of 4 Maccabees', in *The Rhetoric of Righteousness in Romans 3.21-26* (JSNTSup 65; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992), pp. 219–28.
- Collins, J.J., *Between Athens and Jerusalem* (New York: Crossroad, 1983).
- Deissmann, A., 'Das vierte Makkabäerbuch', in E. Kautzsch (ed.), *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments*, vol. II (2 vols.; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1900), pp. 149–77.
- de Jonge, M., 'Jesus' Death for Others and the Death of the Maccabean Martyrs', in *Jewish Eschatology, Early Christian Christology and the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: Collected Essays* (Leiden: Brill, 1991), pp. 125–34.
- deSilva, D.A., *4 Maccabees* (Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998).
- 4 Maccabees: Introduction and Commentary on the Greek Text in Codex Sinaiticus* (Septuagint Commentary Series; Leiden: Brill, 2006).
- 'The Noble Contest: Honor, Shame, and the Rhetorical Strategy of 4 Maccabees', *JSP* 13 (1995), pp. 31–57.
- Dörrie, H., *Passio SS. Machabaeorum* (Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Philologisch-Historische Klasse 3.22; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1938).
- Dupont-Sommer, A., *Le quatrième livre des Machabées* (Paris: Honoré Champion, 1939).
- Freudenthal, J., *Die Flavius Josephus beigelegte Schrift Ueber die Herrschaft der Vernunft (IV Makkabäerbuch)* (Breslau: Schletter'sche Buchhandlung, 1869).
- Fritzsche, O.F., 'ΜΑΚΚΑΒΑΙΩΝ ΤΕΤΑΡΤΟΣ', in *Libri apocryphi Veteris Testamenti graece* (Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus, 1871), pp. 351–86.
- Grimm, C.L.W., 'Viertes Buch der Maccabäer', in O.F. Fritzsche and C.L.W. Grimm (eds.), *Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen des Alten Testaments*, vol. IV (6 vols.; Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1851–1860), pp. 283–370.
- Hadas, M., *The Third and Fourth Books of Maccabees* (Jewish Apocryphal Literature; New York: KTAV, 1951).

- Hiebert, R.J.V., '4 Maccabees 18,6-19—Original Text or Secondary Interpolation?', in W. Kraus and M. Karrer (eds.), *Die Septuaginta—Texte, Theologien, Einflüsse* (WUNT 219; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), pp. 439–49.
- 'Establishing the Textual History of Greek 4 Maccabees', in M. Karrer and W. Kraus (eds.), *Die Septuaginta—Texte, Theologien und Einflüsse* (WUNT 252; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), pp. 117–39.
- 'The Greek Pentateuch and 4 Maccabees', in A. Voitila and J. Jokiranta (eds.), *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls* (Festschrift R. Sollamo; JSJSup 126; Leiden: Brill, 2008), pp. 239–54.
- 'Preparing a Critical Edition of IV Maccabees: The Syriac Translation and *Passio Sanctorum Machabaeorum* as Witnesses to the Original Greek', in F. García Martínez and M. Vervenne (eds.), *Interpreting Translation: Studies on the LXX and Ezekiel* (Festschrift J. Lust; BETL 192; Leuven: Peeters, 2005), pp. 193–216.
- Hiebert, R.J.V., and N.N. Dykstra, 'Septuagint Textual Criticism and the Computer: 4 Maccabees as a Test Case', in M.K.H. Peters (ed.), *XIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Ljubljana, 2007* (SBLSCS 55; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), pp. 167–81.
- Henten, J.W. van, 'Datierung und Herkunft des Vierten Makkabäerbuches', in J.W. van Henten, H.J. de Jonge *et al.* (eds.), *Tradition and Re-interpretation in Jewish and Early Christian Literature* (Leiden: Brill, 1986), pp. 136–49.
- 'A Jewish Epitaph in a Literary Text: 4 Macc 17:8-10', in J.W. van Henten and P.W. van der Horst (eds.), *Studies in Early Jewish Epigraphy* (AGJU 21; Leiden: Brill, 1994), pp. 44–69.
- The Maccabean Martyrs as Saviours of the Jewish People: A Study of 2 and 4 Maccabees* (Leiden: Brill, 1997).
- Inscriptiones graecae ad res romanas pertinentes auctoritate et impensis Academiae inscriptionum et litterarum humaniorum collectae et editae [IGR]*, vol. 1 (Paris: Leroux, 1901).
- Klauck, H.-J., *4. Makkabäerbuch* (JSHRZ 3.6; Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1989).
- Lucchesi, E., 'Découverte d'une traduction copte du quatrième livre des Maccabées (BHG 1006)', *AnBoll* 99 (1981), p. 302.
- 'Encore trois feuillets coptes du Quatrième Livre des Maccabées', in *Écritures et traditions dans la littérature copte: Journée d'études coptes, Strasbourg, 28 mai 1982* (Cahiers de la Bibliothèque Copte 1; Louvain: Peeters, 1983), pp. 21–22.
- Miroshnikov, I., 'The Sahidic Coptic Version of 4 Maccabees', *VT* 64 (2014), pp. 69–92.
- Musurillo, H. (ed.), *The Acts of the Christian Martyrs* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1972).
- Perler, O., 'Das vierte Makkabäerbuch, Ignatius von Antiochien und die ältesten Martyrerberichte', *RAC* 25 (1949), pp. 47–72.
- Peterson, S., 'Martha Shamoni: A Jewish Syriac Rhymed Liturgical Poem about the Maccabean Martyrdoms (Sixth Maccabees)' (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 2006).

- Renehan, R., 'The Greek Philosophical Background of *Fourth Maccabees*', *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 115 (1972), pp. 223–38.
- Scarpat, G., *Quarto libro dei Maccabei* (Biblica testi e studi 9; Brescia: Paideia Editrice, 2006).
- Schaller, B., 'Das 4. Makkabäerbuch als Textzeuge der Septuaginta', in D. Fraenkel, U. Quast, and J.W. Wevers (eds.), *Studien zur Septuaginta* (Festschrift R. Hanhart; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990), pp. 323–31.
- Schatkin, M., 'The Maccabean Martyrs', *VC* 28 (1974), pp. 97–113.
- Shaw, B.D., 'Body/Power/Identity: Passions of the Martyrs', *J ECS* 4 (1996), pp. 269–312.
- Weber, R., 'Eusebeia und Logismos. Zum philosophischen Hintergrund von 4. Makkabäer', *JSJ* 22 (1991), pp. 212–34.
- Winslow, D.F., 'The Maccabean Martyrs: Early Christian Attitudes', *Judaism* 23 (1974), pp. 78–86.

Psalms

James K. Aitken

Editions

(a) Standard Greek Editions

- Göttingen, vol. X, *Psalmi cum Odis* (Rahlfs, 1979, 2nd ed.).
- Rahlfs-Hanhart, vol. II, pp. 1–164.
- Swete, vol. II, pp. 213–415.

(b) Modern Translations

- NETS (Pietersma, 2007), pp. 542–620.
- LXX.D (Bauks *et al.*, 2009), pp. 749–898.

I. General Characteristics

The Greek translation of the Psalms has received particular attention in recent years and has been a subject of dispute. As a translation it presents problems of its own for dating and location, and features of the translation have raised questions regarding the purpose of the translation technique. Whilst one might speculate that the LXX Psalms was one of the first translations to be produced owing to a liturgical need, there is little evidence for liturgical activity in the diaspora before 70 C.E. to draw any conclusions from this (see survey in *BGS*, pp. 68–69). A date in the second century B.C.E. has been the preference of most scholars (Swete, *Intro.*, p. 25; *BGS*, p. 97), and recent research has tended to confirm this. Important for the discussion of the translation has been its high level of lexical equivalence combined with a rich vocabulary, which have

generated much debate on the exegetical character of the translation and the place of origin. Its association with the *kaige* tradition has been a further point of marked discussion.

An additional issue is the presence of a psalm additional to that in the Hebrew canon, Psalm 151. This is a reminder of the flexibility in the content of the Psalms in antiquity, so well illustrated by the major Psalms scroll from Qumran (11QPs^a; see Flint, *Dead Sea*; and, § V).

II. Time and Place of Composition

It could be supposed that the Psalms were one of the first books to be translated in the LXX owing to their likely use in liturgy and their apparent popularity. However, it is equally possible that their liturgical role meant they continued to be used in Hebrew for longer and therefore not translated early. As a result surer methods of dating have been proposed. One good indicator is the use of the allusions to or quotations from the LXX Psalms in later literature. Some of the Psalter's renderings are derived from the Pentateuch and therefore presumably postdate it (Mozley, *Psalter*, p. xiii). This allowed Munnich to examine the Psalms' influence on later books and propose a date in the second century B.C.E. ('Étude'). Williams built on this and gathered and analysed all such cases, especially in LXX Isaiah, LXX Proverbs and 1 Maccabees. He also concluded that the Psalms can be dated to the second century B.C.E. ('Towards a Date'). This conforms to other proposals for a date for the translation. Aejmelaeus ('Characterizing') also tentatively suggests that the Psalter translator's preference for ἀπό over ἐκ speaks in favour of a relatively early date for the Psalter since ἐκ is said to become more frequent in Koine into the late Hellenistic and early Roman period.

Schaper (*Eschatology*, pp. 40–45, 83–84; 'Septuaginta Psalter') and Van der Kooij ('Septuagint') have identified Hasmonean themes and concerns in the translation and therefore place it in that era (see § VI), end of the second or beginning of the first century B.C.E. The translation style, however, has also been a strong influence on theories of both date and location. The connection between the Psalms and the *kaige* tradition has been noted, although the differences between them have also allowed

the Psalms to be dated earlier than the *kaige* itself (Venetz, *Quinta*, pp. 52–57). The key features, which have been endorsed by Van der Kooij ('Place', p. 70), are the close adherence to the Hebrew source text, the use of the expression κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων for 'Lord of Hosts', the occasional use of καὶ γάρ for Hebrew וְאוּ or וְהוּ in similar fashion to καὶ γε (Venetz, *Quinta*, p. 73; cf. *Les devanciers*, pp. 42–43), and the words βᾶρις 'fortress' (Pss. 44[45].9; 47[48].4, 14) and πυργόβαρις (Ps. 121[122].7) as characteristic of the *kaige* group. While Van der Kooij finds Venetz's results convincing on the *kaige* connections, based on the statistics of Busto Saiz (*La traducción*, pp. 295–96) that they share 661 of 888 known parallels in common (=74.4%), it has however been the subject of criticism by many. The translation has affinities to the *kaige* tradition, but seems largely independent of it (cf. Gentry, 'Greek Psalter').

For the location of the translation, some attempts have been made to place it in Palestine. Venetz built upon his observation of a connection between the *kaige* tradition and LXX Psalms to conclude that the LXX Psalms originated in Palestine. Although the Psalms appeared to predate the *kaige*-group, the resemblance suggests they come from Palestine, the home of the *kaige* tradition, assuming its Hebrew focus and the find of the Minor Prophets scroll in Naḥal Hever, Judea (*Quinta*, p. 80). As Pietersma has noted, however, the *kaige* is to be seen only as Palestinian in origin and not exclusively Palestinian ('Place', p. 254), especially given criticism of Barthélemy's comparison with rabbinic hermeneutics (Grabbe, 'Aquila's Translation').

Others have used linguistic arguments to locate the translation. The most commonly cited one has been the appearance of the words βᾶρις 'fortress' and πυργόβαρις. Jerome (*Letter 65* = PL 22, col. 633) records that βᾶρις is only used in Palestine in the sense of fortress (Venetz, *Quinta*, pp. 81–83). Since the sense of fortress is primarily found in Josephus and texts of the *kaige*-group, Van der Kooij argues this confirms the Palestinian use of the word ('Place of Origin', p. 70) noting that in Egypt, where βᾶρις denotes a 'boat', the LXX would have been misunderstood ('Place of Origin', pp. 70–71). It is, however, the nature of homonyms that they can be misunderstood, and the evidence from context allows users to understand which homonym is intended. Homonyms are not always distinguished by geographical location either (Pietersma, 'Place', p. 253). Indeed, inscriptions from Didyma on the

Ionian coast show the use of this word outside Palestine, and contribute to the doubt of relying upon Jerome for reliable linguistic evidence (Aitken, *No Stone*, ch. 6).

The suggestion that there are Pharisaic elements in the translation (see §§ IV and VI) has been used to support a Palestinian location. This is not beyond doubt, however. Even if there are interpretative methods that reflect later rabbinic hermeneutical rules, this does not mean in the earlier period that these are to be associated with the Pharisees. They are natural methods of interpretation, such as harmonisation, and not easily classed to a specific school, even if the Pharisees are only to be seen in Palestine. They might even have their background in Greek methods of interpretation and therefore be universal among ancient authors influenced by Hellenism (Daube, 'Alexandrian').

Pietersma ('Place') has, by contrast, brought together evidence for the location being Egypt, including geographic descriptions that reflect the Egyptian landscape. He also identified words that he views as Egyptian in origin ('Place', p. 270), as they are found in papyri, although using papyri alone does not prove this point. Nevertheless, even if his examples are not strong, there are sufficient associations between the words and Egypt to assume an Egyptian provenance (Aitken, *No Stone*, ch. 6; see § III).

III. Language

There have been a number of studies of the language of the Psalms with focus either on syntax (Sailhamer, *Translational*) or on the vocabulary. Posner's identification of possible Stoic influences, which confirmed for him a date of the first century B.C.E., drew attention to the adjective ἡγεμονικός 'governing' at Ps. 50(51).14 (cf. 4 Macc. 8.7). This might well be a Stoic word (see Diogenes Laertius 7.159), especially given its association in the Psalm with the spirit (πνεῦμα). Ledogar (*Acknowledgment*) has gathered the occurrences of praise verbs and nouns from the Septuagint (especially the Psalter), focussing on the relationship of the words to each other, and the Hebrew words that they appear to translate. Given his interest in the Anaphora the verb εὐχαριστέω is treated in detail, including its use by Philo. Throughout, Ledogar emphasises the 'forensic' origin of the words, by which he means the public character of

the proclamations (*Acknowledgment*, p. 65). Olofsson meanwhile has studied the divine titles in the Greek Psalms (*God Is my Rock*) and has provided helpful data on the translation technique and Hebrew equivalents. It provides an understanding of the translation approach and the modification of divine titles in the Greek, but does not consider the titles in contemporary Greek.

The first consistent analysis of the Septuagint Psalms in the light of the papyri was by Montevecchi, who showed that the vocabulary, including words discussed by Olofsson, derives from petition documents of the Ptolemaic and Roman periods ('Quaedam', pp. 293–310). She observes that terms such as ἀντιλήμπτωρ 'deliverer', βοηθός 'helper', and καταφυγή 'refuge' are applied to God, when in Ptolemaic papyri they were standard normal petitionary terms used in appeals to the king. She notes that they appear more frequently in Ptolemaic-era papyri than Roman, thereby pinpointing the likely chronological context more precisely (Montevecchi, 'Quaedam', p. 106). For her the terms all derive from the Ptolemaic court, and while καταφυγή 'refuge' could also be a designation for a temple, in general the terms are that of court language. The one term not used of God in the Psalms is the seemingly appropriate noun εὐεργέτης 'benefactor', presumably avoided owing to its use as an epithet of two Ptolemies. The significance of these terms is that they could support an Egyptian setting, especially in the case of a word like εὐίλατος 'merciful', which is used both in petitions and in reference to Egyptian gods.

The conclusion from this evidence is twofold. First, it shows that the language in religious contexts has been adopted from the administrative realm. This might not have been the innovation of the translator of Psalms, but a natural development in the language, as implied already in the papyri. The Ptolemies were seen as gods, and therefore when making an appeal to the king it sometimes included an address to him as a divine figure. Second, these terms are those of the language in daily use. Indeed, the word ἀντιλήμπτωρ only appears in the papyri and in Jewish or Christian literature influenced by the LXX. It was never used in a literary context. Thus, even for a literary and religious text such as the Psalms, the language chosen was the standard Koine of everyday language. This does not mean that the text is devoid of occasional literary words or

rhetorical elements (see § IV). Rather, what can be seen from these two apparently contradictory statements—that the language is adopted from Ptolemaic religious terms and that the language is the vernacular—is that the translator did not choose the standard language of Greek religious hymns. While some of the terms can be found in Egyptian religious contexts, it is the language of minor cults rather than of the Olympian deities.

IV. Translation and Composition

The case for a single translator was defended by Mozley (*Psalter*, p. xii), and it has been confirmed by Munnich ('Indices', pp. 407–408) that the translation can be seen as a unity. The translation style is one that conforms very closely to its Hebrew source text. Word order and lexical equivalence are maintained for the most part, reflecting once more the *kaige* tradition (see § II). It is possible, though, that while generally maintaining strict correspondence to his source text, the translator exercised some freedom and creativity (Schaper, *Messianism*; Bons, 'Rhetorical', p. 69). This includes modifications of the text according to his own theological positions, such as to avoid the possibility of a plurality of gods (Pss. 8.6[5]; 96[97].7; 137[138].1) when there is no textual justification for a different reading (see further Bons, 'Rede', pp. 185–99; 'Septuaginta', pp. 464–68).

Schaper and others (Gzella, *Lebenszeit*) have also identified some possible interpretative elements in the Psalms translation, and although some of his methods have been questioned (e.g., Cox, 'Schaper's *Eschatology*') he does offer some informative examples of where the translation appears to be expansive. He draws particularly on the work of Frankel (*Vorstudien*) in the mid-nineteenth century and Prijs (*Jüdische*) and Koenig (*L'herméneutique*) in the twentieth who all saw later rabbinic hermeneutical techniques prefigured in the LXX. Schaper finds these 'proto-Rabbinic exegetical methods', similar to Tov's 'midrash-type' texts and actualisations, in the Greek Psalms. He thus finds the exegetical method of *gezerah shavah*, whereby one passage is modified to conform to another similar one, in LXX Ps. 55(56).9. There a reference in the

Hebrew to a ‘book’ appears in the LXX as a ‘promise’ (ἐν τῇ ἐπαγγελίᾳ σου). Schaper follows Flashar and suggests the promise (an exegetical rendering in the light of Hebrew רפס—probably read as the verb) is an allusion to Isa. 25.8 in the context of the eschatological banquet drawing together the nations in Jerusalem. In Isaiah it is announced that God ‘has wiped away the tears from every cheek’, while Ps. 55(56).9 speaks of tears being visible before God. The translator of the Psalms, viewing both texts as God’s pity on the tears of his people, chose ἐπαγγελία ‘promise’ to allude to Isaiah 25. Schaper therefore suggests that this technique is the same as the rabbinic principle of Hillel, the *gezerah shavah*. For the sake of clarity Schaper argues that it is easier to use the later rabbinic terms in order to systematise the exegetical principles behind the Septuagint Psalms. Elsewhere he identifies *al tiqre* readings and other techniques comparable to the rules of Hillel.

Despite the close quantitative equivalence, the translator was able to introduce some rhetorical techniques to improve the literary quality of the translation. These are only occasional, but Bons (‘Rhetorical’) has been able to identify features that are not dependent upon the MT or the Qumran Hebrew manuscripts and therefore probably inventions of the translator. These include the use of hyperbaton at Pss. 33(34).13; 36(37).16, alliteration at Ps. 48(47).11 (ἄφρων καὶ ἄνους ‘fool and dolt’); 62(63).2 (ἄβᾶτω καὶ ἀνύδρω ‘trackless and waterless’); 50(51).12, and paronomasia (the juxtaposing of words from the same root) in many cases. Among the last category Ps. 17(18).16 is a good example for its sophisticated use of ἀπὸ ἐμπνεύσεως πνεύματος ‘at the blast of the breath’.

V. Key Text-Critical Issues

On the evidence of the Dead Sea Psalms (e.g., 11QPs^a) the Hebrew text of the Psalter was not fixed until the first century C.E. (Sanders, *Psalms Scroll*; Flint, *Dead Sea*). 11QPs^a conforms to the Septuagint in including Psalm 151 (see below), but its arrangement of the Psalms is different and includes additional ‘apocryphal’ psalms. Cave 4 Psalms manuscripts, meanwhile, display divergence from both the Septuagint and the Masoretic text. Ulrich (‘Dead Sea’, pp. 333–34) presents the hypothesis that the

extant Greek text is a recension of an earlier version, but does not provide strong evidence from the Psalter itself. What seems clear is that the LXX Psalms are based on a *Vorlage* close in reading and arrangement to the MT, even if there has been significant corruption of both the *Vorlage* and the later MT. The manuscript witnesses of the Greek are extensive and diverse.

There is considerable diversity in the Psalms headings, with differences between the MT, Qumran scrolls, and the LXX. It is generally considered that the headings were not integral to the Hebrew text (Pietersma, ‘David’; Dorival, ‘Autour’).

The presence of the additional Psalm 151 in the LXX presents its own problems. The psalm is also known in the Syriac tradition of the Psalter, where it appears along with other Syriac psalms. The discovery of the *Psalms Scroll* from Qumran (11QPs^a [11Q5]) provided a Hebrew version of two Psalms that correspond to Psalm 151, and confirmed that the psalm was translated from a Hebrew source. It focuses on the rise of David, drawing upon 1 Samuel 16–17. When the Qumran Psalm was found, it was thought that the Greek, seen as textually inferior and corrupt, is an amalgamation of two Hebrew Psalms. Accordingly Sanders labelled the Hebrew version ‘Psalm 151A and 151B’. However, contrary to Sanders’s confident assertion that 11QPs 151 is the original version (*Psalms Scroll*, p. 60), greater appreciation has grown for the Greek version. As a result there are a number of scholars who would argue for the Greek being original rather than corrupt and for the Hebrew as a secondary expansion of the *Vorlage* behind the Greek version (Segal, ‘Literary Development’).

VI. Ideology and Exegesis

The exegetical character of the Psalter translation is an area of some disagreement among scholars. Whilst being a translation displaying a high degree of lexical equivalence, the choice of lexemes has been taken by some as indicative of an interpretative strand in the translation. It is difficult, however, to assume a word has been chosen for exegetical purposes when it is a standard translation equivalent. Thus, while Schaper and Gzella have made a case that the translation reflects theological and

political ideologies through its choice of vocabulary, some have proposed that it is not always possible to make such judgements (Pietersma, 'Septuagintal Exegesis'; Cox, 'Schaper's *Eschatology*'). In Ps. 1.5, for example, Schaper interprets ἀνάσθημι as evidence that the translator advocated resurrection from the dead, although it is a standard equivalent for the Hebrew verb קוּם (Austermann, 'Thesen'). It does have an effect on later interpretation of the psalm but it does not prove the intention of the translator. Much debate has centred on these problems.

Flashar ('Exegetische') noted many examples of possible exegetical translations in the Greek Psalter, and suggested that certain features reflect an Egyptian setting, notably the epithets used of God (cf. Pietersma, 'Exegesis', p. 253), and in this he was following the commonly held opinion that all Septuagint books derived from Egypt. However, the idea that the Psalms translation could come from Palestine, especially given its affinity with the *kaige* tradition, has led to some possible conclusions regarding its purpose. Van der Kooij ('Septuagint') sees the translation as deriving from a Pharisaic milieu and, in response to Pietersma's discussion of the Psalm headings ('David'), he argued that the Psalm headings had significance for the ordering of the Psalter. The headings indicate that the Psalms were arranged according to Jewish tradition following the days of the week (i.e. 23.1; 47.1; 93.1; 92.1; 91.1), and the addition of liturgical notes in the Greek indicate a milieu of the Jerusalem temple for the LXX Psalter ('Place', pp. 71–72). Flashar ('Exegetische', pp. 185, 246) had already noted the interest of the Greek Psalter in the Jerusalem Temple. Van der Kooij's argument is partly dependent on whether the headings are genuine, and he concludes that if they are derived from Jerusalem and the Temple then they are most likely to be genuine. We are still, however, faced with the likelihood that they are later additions, as Pietersma argued ('David'; 'Present State').

Van der Kooij ('Septuagint') has also drawn attention to the concept of 'priestly monarchy' in LXX Psalms (Pss. 78[79].2-3; 109[110].4) and compared them with passages in 1 Maccabees (7.17; 14.41 respectively). He concludes that the translation might come from pro-Maccabean circles and that this would support the idea that the evidence points to 'Judaea (Jerusalem) as the place of origin' ('Septuagint', p. 246). He does remain cautious, however, recognising that it could have been composed in

Egypt by people from a Judean background. 1 Maccabees 7 at least indicates that the LXX Psalms was available in Jerusalem at the time (perhaps late second century B.C.E.). If, however, it can be shown that one work is dependent on the other, that at least indicates access to the book, although it does not prove they came from the same circles.

Schaper (*Eschatology*, pp. 34–45) discovers Hasmonean references in LXX Psalms 59(60) (*Eschatology*, pp. 40–45) and 107(108) (*Eschatology*, pp. 83–84). The translation in these two Psalms of *Ἰουδας βασιλεύς μου* ‘Judas my King’ he takes as referring to Judas Maccabaeus, providing a *terminus post quem* of ca. 165. The choice of *Ἰουδας* rather than *Ἰουδαία* is noteworthy, and the use of *βασιλεύς* could support this interpretation. Certainly, the text might have a messianic reference in the same way that the Hebrew does, but it cannot be certain that the reference is to a historical figure. The content of the Psalms can, nevertheless, be seen as an appropriate backdrop for the events recorded in 1 and 2 Maccabees. Problematic for this interpretation, however, is that Judas Maccabaeus never adopted the title of king, which was only accepted by the Hasmoneans at the end of the first century. Even if the Psalms do refer to him, it does not prove a date in the second century or a Palestinian origin, as Schaper argues (Williams, ‘Towards a Date’, pp. 262–63).

Schaper’s identification of exegetical traditions in the LXX Psalms that are also attested in later rabbinic and targumic works (see § IV) is a valuable insight into the working methods of the translator. This provides evidence of the history of the rabbinic rules of exegesis, also found in the Dead Sea Scrolls, New Testament, other parts of the LXX and even in the Hebrew Bible itself. As a contribution to the history of rabbinic exegesis it is informative. It is uncertain whether they can be attributed to a specific group at the time of the translator, such that his attribution of them to Pharisaic circles and a Palestinian movement cannot be proven. That something at a later time was believed by the Pharisees does not mean that everything similar earlier is a form of Pharisaism.

Although the translation technique does not allow for straightforward conclusions on the translator’s exegesis or theology, the network of ideas and vocabulary in the Psalms could reflect the translator’s theological stance. The translator does not avoid eschatological themes, as recorded by Schaper, and even a regular translation feature is indicative of his

acceptance of them. The reference to the unicorn, although once more a standard translation equivalent, could have been chosen as symbolic of the messiah (Schaper, 'Unicorn'). The translator also appears to focus on the definition of sin as a breaking of νόμος 'the law' (Austermann, *Von der Tora*), and in similar fashion to other LXX translations, such as Proverbs (Cook, 'Law') and Isaiah (Wagner, *Reading*), heightens the ethical vocabulary around legal terminology.

VII. Reception History

The Psalms were extremely popular in antiquity, and as a result there is extensive use of the LXX Psalms in Jewish Greek works (Williams, 'Towards a Date') and in the New Testament (Moyise and Menken, *The Psalms*). It is not possible to cover all the data here and a few suggestive examples shall be given. Wisdom of Solomon already alludes to the Psalms, probably to the Greek version. Wis. 1.1-15 borrows from Psalm 2 and Wis. 6.1-21 from Ps. 44(45).8 (Skehan, 'Borrowings', pp. 384-97). *Joseph and Aseneth* also seems to be dependent on the LXX Psalter, showing awareness of Psalm 18(19) at 5.5-6.6 (Delling, 'Einwirkungen').

In the New Testament Rev. 10.2-4 appears to be familiar with the LXX rendering of Ps. 28(29).3 (Cambe, 'L'interprétation', pp. 228-29), as does Acts 2 (Sailhamer, *Translational Technique*, p. 1). The ongoing interpretation of the Psalms can be traced through many church fathers too (Holladay, *Psalms*). A significant influence of the Psalms, however, is the way that its distinctive language has influenced later Christian vocabulary. The use of εἰσακούω 'to listen to' of prayer in the New Testament is due in large part to its frequency in prayer language in the Greek Psalter (Cox, 'Εἰσακούω', pp. 252-53, 258). The noun ἀντιλήμπτωρ 'deliverer', although originally deriving from Ptolemaic language and never used in literature before the LXX (§ III), becomes a standard term of address to God in Christian liturgy, including in inscriptions. At the same time βοηθός 'helper' is only occasionally used of God in later liturgy, but can still be found (Bons, 'Noun'), especially in inscriptions from Ephesus.

Bibliography

- Aejmelaeus, A., 'Characterizing Criteria for the Characterization of the Septuagint Translators: Experimenting on the Greek Psalter', in R.J.V. Hiebert, C.E. Cox and P.J. Gentry (eds.), *The Old Greek Psalter* (Festschrift A. Pietersma; JSOTSup 332; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), pp. 54–73.
- Austermann, F., 'Thesen zur Septuaginta-Exegese am Beispiel der Untersuchung des Septuaginta-Psalter', in A. Aejmelaeus and U. Quast (eds.), *Der Septuaginta-Psalter und seine Tochterübersetzungen* (MSU 24; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), pp. 381–86.
- 'Von der Tora im hebräischen Psalm 119 zum Nomos im griechischen Psalm 118. Was die Wiedergabe über die Gesetzestheologie des Übersetzers verrät und was nicht', in E. Zenger (ed.), *Der Septuaginta-Psalter. Sprachliche und theologische Aspekte* (Herders biblische Studien 32; Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 2001), pp. 330–47.
- Von der Tora zum Nomos. Untersuchungen zur Übersetzungsweise und Interpretation im Septuaginta-Psalter* (MSU 27; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003).
- Bons, E., 'The Noun *βοηθός* as a Divine Title', in E. Bons, R. Brucker, and J. Joosten (eds.), *The Reception of Septuagint Words in Jewish-Hellenistic and Christian Literature* (WUNT 2.367; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014).
- 'Die Rede von Gott in den Psalmen^{LXX}', in H.-J. Fabry and D. Böhler (ed.), *Im Brennpunkt: Die Septuaginta. Band 3: Studien zur Theologie, Anthropologie, Ekklesiologie, Eschatologie und Liturgie der Griechischen Bibel* (BWANT 174; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2007), pp. 182–202.
- 'Rhetorical Devices in the Septuagint Psalter', in E. Bons and T.J. Kraus (eds.), *Et Sapienter Et Eloquenter: Studies on Rhetorical and Stylistic Features of the Septuagint* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), pp. 69–79.
- 'Der Septuaginta-Psalter – Übersetzung, Interpretation, Korrektur', in M. Karrer and W. Kraus (ed.), *Die Septuaginta. Texte – Kontexte – Lebenswelten* (WUNT 219; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), pp. 450–70.
- Busto Saiz, J.R., *La traducción de Simaco el Libro de los Salmos* (Textos y estudios Cardenal Cisneros 22; Madrid: Instituto Arias Montano, 1978).
- Caloz, M., *Etude sur la LXX origénienne du psautier: les relations entre les leçons des Psaumes du Manuscrit Coislin 44, les Fragments des Hexaples et le texte du Psautier* (OBO 19; Fribourg, Suisse: Editions universitaires, 1978).
- Cook, J., 'The Law of Moses in Septuagint Proverbs', *VT* 49 (1999), pp. 448–61.
- Cox, C.E., 'Εἰσακούω and ἐπακούω in the Greek Psalter', *Bib* 62 (1981), pp. 251–58.
- 'Schaper's Eschatology meets Kraus's Theology of the Psalms', in R.J.V. Hiebert, C.E. Cox, and P.J. Gentry (eds.), *The Old Greek Psalter* (Festschrift A. Pietersma; JSOTSup 332; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), pp. 289–311.
- Daube, D., 'Alexandrian Methods of Interpretation and the Rabbis', in *Festschrift Hans Lewald* (Basel: Helbing & Lichtenhahn, 1953), pp. 27–44.

The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint

- Delling, G., 'Einwirkungen der Sprache der Septuaginta in "Joseph und Aseneth"', *JSJ* 9 (1978), pp. 29–56.
- Dirival, G., 'A propos de quelques titres des Psaumes de la Septante', in *Le Psautier chez les Pères* (Strasbourg: Centre d'Analyse et de Documentation Patristiques, 1994), pp. 21–36.
- 'Autour des titres des Psaumes', *RSR* 73 (1999), pp. 165–76.
- Flashar, M., 'Exegetische Studien zum Septuagintapsalter', *ZAW* 32 (1912), pp. 81–116, 161–89, 241–68.
- Flint, P.W., *The Dead Sea Psalms Scroll and the Book of Psalms* (STDJ 17; Leiden: Brill, 1997).
- Frankel, Z., *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta* (Historisch-Kritische Studien zu der Septuaginta 1.1; Leipzig: Vogel, 1841).
- Gentry, P.J., 'The Greek Psalter and the *καίτε* Tradition: Methodological Questions', in R.J.V. Hiebert, C.E. Cox, and P.J. Gentry (eds.), *The Old Greek Psalter* (Festschrift A. Pietersma; JSOTSup 332; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), pp. 74–97.
- Grabbe, L.L., 'Aquila's Translation and Rabbinic Exegesis', *JJS* 33 (1982), pp. 527–36.
- Gzella, H., *Lebenszeit und Ewigkeit: Studien zur Eschatologie und Anthropologie des Septuaginta-Psalters* (BBB 134; Berlin: Philo, 2002).
- Hiebert, R.J.V., C.E. Cox, and P.J. Gentry (eds.), *The Old Greek Psalter* (Festschrift A. Pietersma; JSOTSup 332; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001).
- Holladay, W.L., *The Psalms through Three Thousand Years: Prayerbook of a Cloud of Witnesses* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993).
- Koenig, J., *L'herméneutique analogique du judaïsme antique d'après les témoins textuels d'Isaïe* (VTSup 33; Leiden: Brill, 1982).
- Kooij, A. van der, 'On the Place of Origin of the Old Greek of Psalms', *VT* 33 (1983), pp. 67–74.
- 'The Septuagint of Psalms and the First Book of Maccabees', in R.J.V. Hiebert, C.E. Cox, and P.J. Gentry (eds.), *The Old Greek Psalter* (Festschrift A. Pietersma; JSOTSup 332; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), pp. 229–47.
- 'Zur Frage der Exegese im LXX-Psalter. Ein Beitrag zur Verhältnisbestimmung zwischen Original und Übersetzung', in A. Aejmelaeus and U. Quast (eds.), *Der Septuaginta-Psalter und seine Tochterübersetzungen* (MSU 24; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), pp. 366–80.
- Ledogar, R.J., *Acknowledgment: Praise-Verbs in the Early Greek Anaphora* (Rome: Herder, 1968).
- Loewenstamm, S.E., 'The Historical Background to the Septuagint Translation of Psalm 29:5-6', in E. Loewenstamm, *From Babylon to Canaan. Studies in the Bible and Its Oriental Background* (Hebrew University/Jerusalem: Magnes, 1992), pp. 280–91.
- Moyise, S., and M.J.J. Menken (eds.), *The Psalms in the New Testament* (London: T&T Clark International, 2004).

- Montevocchi, O., 'Quaedam de graecitate psalorum cum papyris comparata', in *Proceedings of the IX International Congress of Papyrology. Oslo 19–22 August 1958* (Oslo: Norwegian Universities Press, 1961), pp. 293–310.
- Mozley, F.W., *The Psalter of the Church: The Septuagint Psalms Compared with the Hebrew, with Various Notes* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1905).
- Munnich, O., 'Contribution à l'étude de la première révision de la Septante', *ANRW* II.20.1 (1987), pp. 190–220.
- 'Étude lexicographique du Psautier des Septante' (Ph.D. dissertation, Paris-Sorbonne, 1982).
- 'Indices d'une Septante originelle dans le Psautier grec', *Bib* 63 (1982), pp. 406–16.
- 'La Septante des Psaumes et le groupe *Kaige*', *VT* 33 (1983), pp. 75–89.
- Olofsson, S., *God Is My Rock: A Study of Translation Technique and Theological Exegesis in the Septuagint* (CBOT 31; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 1990).
- Pietersma, A., 'David in the Greek Psalter', *VT* 30 (1980), pp. 213–26.
- 'Exegesis and Liturgy in the Superscriptions of the Greek Psalter', in B. Taylor (ed.), *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo 1998* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001), pp. 99–138.
- 'The Place of Origin of the Old Greek Psalter', in P.M.M. Daviau, J.W. Wevers, and M. Weigl (eds.), *The World of the Aramaeans I: Biblical Studies in Honour of Paul-Eugène Dion* (JSOTSup 324; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), pp. 252–74.
- 'The Present State of the Critical Text of the Greek Psalter', in A. Aejmelaeus and U. Quast (eds.), *Der Septuaginta-Psalter und seine Tochterübersetzungen* (MSU 24; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), pp. 12–32.
- 'Septuagint Research: A Plea for a Return to Basic Issues', *VT* 35 (1985), pp. 296–311.
- 'Septuagintal Exegesis and the Superscriptions of the Greek Psalter', in P.W. Flint and P.D. Miller (eds.), *The Book of Psalms: Composition and Reception* (Leiden: Brill, 2005), pp. 443–75.
- Posner, A., 'Stoischer Einfluss im LXX-Psalter', *ZAW* 43 (1935), p. 276.
- Prijs, L., *Jüdische Tradition in der Septuaginta* (Leiden: Brill, 1948).
- Sailhamer, J.H., *The Translational Technique of the Greek Septuagint for the Hebrew Verbs and Participles in Psalms* (Studies in Biblical Greek 2; New York: Peter Lang, 1991).
- Sanders, J.A., *The Psalms Scroll of Qumrân Cave 11 (11QP^a)* (DJD 4; Oxford: Clarendon, 1965).
- Schaper, J.L.W., *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter* (WUNT 2/76; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1995).
- 'Der Septuaginta-Psalter als Dokument juedischer Eschatologie', in M. Hengel and A. Maria Schwemer (eds.), *Die Septuaginta zwischen Judentum und Christentum* (WUNT 72; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994), pp. 38–61.

- ‘Der Septuaginta Psalter. Interpretation, Aktualisierung und liturgische Verwendung der biblischen Psalmen im hellenistischen Judentum’, in E. Zenger (ed.), *Der Psalter in Judentum und Christentum* (HS 18; Freiburg: Herder, 1998), pp. 165–83.
- ‘The Unicorn in the Messianic Imagery of the Greek Bible’, *JTS* 45 (1994), pp. 117–36.
- Segal, M., ‘The Literary Development of Psalm 151: A New Look at the Septuagint Version’, *Textus* 21 (2002), pp. 139–58.
- Skehan, P.W., ‘Borrowings from the Psalms in the Book of Wisdom’, *CBQ* 10 (1948), pp. 384–97.
- Ulrich, E.C., ‘The Dead Sea Scrolls and Their Implications for an Edition of the Septuagint Psalter’, in A. Aejmelaeus and U. Quast (eds.), *Der Septuaginta-Psalter und seine Tochterübersetzungen* (MSU 24; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), pp. 323–36.
- Venetz, H.-J., *Quinta des Psalteriums: ein Beitrag zur Septuaginta- und Hexapla-forschung* (Collection Massorah 1; Études classiques et textes 2; Hildesheim: Gerstenberg, 1974).
- Wagner, J.R., *Reading the Sealed Book: Old Greek Isaiah and the Problem of Septuagint Hermeneutics* (FAT 88; Tübingen/Waco: Mohr Siebeck/Baylor University Press, 2013).
- Walters, P. [Katz], *The Text of the Septuagint: Its Corruptions and Their Emendations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973).
- Williams, T.F., ‘Towards a Date for the Old Greek Psalter’, in R.J.V. Hiebert, C.E. Cox and P.J. Gentry (eds.), *The Old Greek Psalter* (Festschrift A. Pietersma; JSOTSup 332; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), pp. 248–76.

Prayer of Manasseh (*Odes* 12)

James K. Aitken

Editions

(a) Standard Greek Editions

Göttingen, vol. X, *Psalmi cum Odis* (Rahlfs, 1979, 3rd ed.).

Rahlfs-Hanhart, vol. II, pp. 180–81.

Swete, vol. III, pp. 824–26.

(b) Other Editions

Black and Denis, *Apocalypsis Henochi*, pp. 115–17.

Schneider, 'Der Vulgata'.

The Old Testament in Syriac 4.6 (Baars and Schneider, 1972).

Connolly, *Didascalica*.

Funk, *Didascalica*, vol. I, pp. 80–91.

(c) Modern Translations

NETS (Pietersma, 2007), p. 620.

OTP II, pp. 625–37 (Hamilton, 1985).

Horst and Newman, *Early Jewish Prayers* (Newman), pp. 165–66.

LXX.D (Engel and Lattke, 2009), pp. 912–13.

Oßwald, 'Das Gebet'.

Apocrifos, vol. III (Vegas Montaner, 1982), pp. 101–17.

I. General Characteristics

The Prayer of Manasseh, a short work of only 15 verses, is one of the poetic compositions found in the *Odes* of the LXX, a collection appended in some codices and manuscripts to the Greek Psalms. The majority of the *Odes* is a compilation of hymns and prayers extracted from the books

of the LXX and New Testament (and therefore not of further consideration here), but the Prayer of Manasseh is an independent composition, possibly of Jewish origin. It is clearly intended to supply the words of King Manasseh, who is said to pray to God at 2 Chron. 33.13 but where the words of the prayer are not given.

In addition to the later Greek tradition, the Prayer is found in Syriac in the early third-century *Didascalia* and in Latin in the *Apostolic Constitutions*. An unrelated version is attested at Qumran (4Q381 33.8) and a Hebrew version appears in the medieval Cairo Genizah (see § VII). The textual history displays diversity given the survival of witnesses in various languages and literary contexts. It remains uncertain whether the Greek is a translation of a Hebrew version or an original Greek composition, and the origins and setting are equally hard to reconstruct.

II. Time and Place of Composition

A precise date or location for the composition or even translation of the Prayer cannot be ascertained. The appearance in the *Didascalia* provides a *terminus ad quem* of the early third century. There are no explicit Christian elements to suggest it is Christian, but the possibility has to remain open (cf. Davila, 'Prayer'). The *Apostolic Constitutions* have often been thought to include Jewish material (see Fiensy, *Prayers*) so that its largely Christian preservation is not a problem.

It can be placed generically within the tradition of prayers, especially of confession, from Second Temple times. These include prayers in the Hebrew Bible (Ezra 9; Neh. 9; Dan. 9), those added to the Septuagint (LXX Daniel 3; LXX Esther Prayer) and those in apocryphal works (Bar. 1.15–3.8; 3 Macc. 2.1–20; *Pss. Sol.* 9; 1QS 1.24–2.1; CD 20.28–30; see Newman, 'Prayer', p. 147). The presence of a different and independent Hebrew prayer of Manasseh from Qumran (4Q381 33.8), dated paleographically to the first century B.C.E., shows that there was an early Jewish tradition around the figure of Manasseh and a desire to supplement the words of his prayer. The Qumran version, which is dependent on 2 Chronicles 33 but separate from the Greek tradition (Schniedewind, 'Qumran Fragment'), likewise forms part of a collection of prayers (4Q380–381). Its origins cannot be located more firmly than sometime before the first century B.C.E.

III. Language

In such a short prayer little can be said of the Greek language. As will be seen (§ IV) the influence of LXX Exod. 34.6 is apparent in the description of the divine attributes. Many standard terms from the Psalms also appear, including *μεγαλοπρέπεια* ‘magnificence’ (v. 5; cf. Pss. 8.2; 20[21].6[7], etc.), *ἀνυπόστατος* ‘irresistible’ (v. 5; Ps. 123[124].5), and *χρηστότης* ‘kindness’ (v. 11; Pss. 13[14].1, 3; 20[21].4[3]). Some terms, however, are not from the Psalms and are barely used in the LXX, such as *ἀμέτρητος* ‘immeasurable’ (v. 6; cf. Sir. 16.17; 3 Macc. 4.17) and *ἀτενίζω* ‘to look at’ (v. 9; 1 Esd. 6.27; 3 Macc. 2.26). Some are unique to the Prayer in the LXX and very rare in Greek: *ἄστεκτος* ‘unbearable’ (v. 5) and *εὐσπλαγγνος* ‘compassionate’ (v. 7; cf. New Testament). The latter appears to be the equivalent of *οικτίρμων* from Exod. 34.6 (Newman, ‘Prayer’, p. 173) and reflects the occasional independence of the translation from the LXX (see further Passoni Dell’Acqua, ‘La preghiera’).

IV. Translation and Composition

The Prayer has been composed as, or at least attributed to, the missing words of Manasseh’s prayer mentioned in 2 Chron. 33.11-13. The prayer was said to have been recorded in the chronicles of the seers (2 Chron. 33.19). In the version of the *Odes* in Codex Alexandrinus, the earliest Greek witness, and in the *Didascalia*, the prayer contains a superscription ‘prayer of Manasseh’, making clear the attribution. As many Psalms, the prayer opens with a call to God through a description of his powers in creation. Verses 6-7 describe the divine attributes, drawing upon Exodus 34. A major influence on the composition is the language of Exod. 34.6: *Κύριος ὁ θεὸς οἰκτίρμων καὶ ἐλεήμων, μακρόθυμος καὶ πολυέλεος καὶ ἀληθινός* ‘The Lord, the Lord God is compassionate and merciful, patient and very merciful and truthful’. The Prayer continues with the confession (vv. 8-12) before a petition (v. 13) and recognition of divine deliverance (vv. 13-14). It concludes with a vow to praise God and a standard doxology (v. 15).

As the language is conventional, there is little to determine whether it is a translation or a free composition. There are no signs of translation errors or obvious Semitic interference and therefore it is reasonable to

assume it is a composition. Furthermore, some of the language diverges from standard lexical equivalents in the LXX (§ III), which could be a sign that this is not a translation.

V. Key Text-Critical Issues

The differing sources of preservation of the Prayer have resulted in different textual histories. In some Septuagint manuscripts it appears as a part of the book of Odes, attached to the book of Psalms. In the Latin (and Ethiopic) tradition it serves as an appendix to 2 Chronicles, reflecting its purpose to fill in the words of Manasseh in that book. In Greek the Prayer and the Odes in which it is included first make an appearance in the fifth-century Codex Alexandrinus, and continue in many manuscripts after that time (see Mearns, *Canticles*). There is considerable variation in the superscription between the manuscripts and versions (Newman, 'Prayer', p. 166), largely varying in the detail given to the context of Manasseh's prayer.

In Syriac the Prayer first appears in the third-century *Didascalia*. It only appears in the Peshitta from the ninth century (Paris MS 9aI), as part of the *Odes*. The differences between the two versions are slight, which makes it likely that the Peshitta is dependent on the *Didascalia* (Baars and Schneider, 'Prayer', p. ii). The Latin witnesses are late, appearing first in the *Apostolic Constitutions* (sixth century), and only reaching the Vulgate much later.

The Medieval Hebrew version of the prayer from the Cairo Genizah shows traces (in possible mistranslations) of having been translated from Syriac and possibly too of the influence of translation from Greek (Leicht, 'Newly Discovered'). It is, however, not a direct descendant since it shows traces of Rabbinic Hebrew and midrashic tradition as well.

VI. Ideology and Exegesis

Other than its place within the traditions of Second Temple Jewish prayers (§ II), little can be said of its ideology. The ascription to Manasseh indicates it forms part of a tradition on the sin of Manasseh, but little is indicated in the prayer itself of Manasseh's actual actions. This suggests it might have been written independently of the Manasseh

tradition. Manasseh is recorded in the Bible as one of the most idolatrous of the kings (2 Kgs 21.1-18) and, once taken captive by the Assyrians, he turns from his idolatrous ways in response to his prayer for mercy (2 Chron. 33.10-17). However, there is no suggestion of idolatry in the Prayer, and while idolatry was a theme in a number of apocryphal works (Wisdom of Solomon; Ep. Jer.) the Prayer does not seem to fit in with these.

The focus on God's mercy and deliverance is a conventional theme throughout literature of the time. The lack of specificity in this Prayer allowed its reuse in collections of antiquity.

VII. Reception History

The broad distribution of the Prayer in the sources is indicative of its wide use, possibly for a range of purposes. One can only speculate regarding its use in early Judaism, whether for private prayer or communal worship in temple or synagogue. The presence of the *Odes* in Greek biblical manuscripts suggests in early Christianity they were used in liturgical settings, perhaps for singing or reciting on feast days. In the *Didascalia*, the Prayer appears in a chapter addressed to bishops on the role of repentance. The Prayer was obviously used as an example of proper repentance in Christian teaching.

The Genizah version, from at least the tenth century, shows the use of the Prayer even in Judaism. It forms part of a quire of prayers and incantations (T-S K 1.144, T-S K 21.95P, and T-S K 95.T) that might suggest it was used as a prayer for deliverance from some malady, or as a general prayer. Speculation on the liturgical use is possible (Leicht, 'Newly Discovered', p. 369), but there is no indication in the manuscript as to its purpose.

Bibliography

- Black, M., and A.-M. Denis, *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece, edidit M. Black. Fragmenta pseudepigraphorum quae supersunt graeca una cum historicorum et auctorum judaeorum hellenistarum fragmentis, collegit et ordinavit Albert-Marie Denis* (PVTG 3; Leiden: Brill, 1970).
- Connolly, R.H., *Didascalia apostolorum: The Syriac Version Translated and Accompanied by the Verona Latin Fragments* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1929).

- Davila, J.R., 'Is the Prayer of Manasseh a Jewish Work?', in L. LiDonnici and A. Lieber (eds.), *Heavenly Tablets: Interpretation, Identity and Tradition in Ancient Judaism* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), pp. 75–85.
- Dogniez, C., 'Les Odes ajoutées au Psautier dans la Septante comme actes de langage', in M.K. Peters (ed.), *XIV Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Helsinki, 2010* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013), pp. 645–62.
- Fieny, D.A., *Prayers Alleged to Be Jewish: An Examination of the Constitutiones apostolorum* (Brown Judaic Studies 65; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985).
- Funk, F.X., *Didascalia et Constitutiones apostolorum* (2 vols.; Paderborn: in libraria Ferdinandi Schoeningh, 1905).
- Horst, P.W. van der, and J.H. Newman, *Early Jewish Prayers in Greek* (Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008).
- Leicht, R., 'A Newly Discovered Hebrew Version of the Apocryphal "Prayer of Manasseh"', *JSQ* 3 (1996), pp. 359–73.
- Mearns, J., *Canticles of the Christian Church, Eastern and Western in Warly and Medieval Times* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1914).
- Newman, J.H., 'Prayer', in P.W. van der Horst and J.H. Newman, *Early Jewish Prayers in Greek* (Commentaries on early Jewish literature; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008), pp. 145–80.
- Oßwald, E., 'Das Gebet Manasses' (JSHRZ 4/1; Gütersloh: Mohn, 1974), pp. 17–27.
- Passoni Dell'Acqua, A., 'La preghiera di Manasse: un esempio di fantasia linguistica per cantare la misericordia di Dio', in R. Pierri (ed.), *Grammatica intellectio Scripturae: Saggi filologici di Greco biblico in onore di Lino Cignelli OFM* (Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, 2006), pp. 117–56.
- Rahlfs, A. (ed.), *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum*. Vol. X, *Psalmi cum Odis* (3rd ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979 [1931]).
- Schneider, H., 'Der Vulgata-Text der Oratio Manasse: eine Rezension des Robertus Stephanus', *BZ* 4 (1960), pp. 277–82.
- Schniedewind, W.M., 'A Qumran Fragment of the Ancient "Prayer of Manasseh"?' *ZAW* 108 (1996), pp. 105–107.
- Vegas Montaner, L., 'Oración de Manases', in A. Díez Macho (ed.), *Apócrifos del Antiguo Testamento*, vol. III (Madrid: Cristiandad, 1982), pp. 101–17.

Proverbs

James K. Aitken and Lorenzo Cuppi

Editions

(a) Standard Greek Editions

- Göttingen (none available at present).
- Rahlfs-Hanhart, vol. II, pp. 183–238.
- Swete, vol. II, pp. 416–79.

(b) Modern Translations

- NETS (Cook, 2007), pp. 621–47.
- LXX.D (Jüngling *et al.*, 2009), pp. 935–77.
- Bd'A 17* (d'Hamonville, 2000).

I. General Characteristics

The gnomic material of the Hebrew book of Proverbs, itself attributed pseudepigraphically to a king, namely Solomon (1.1), should be a natural source for adaptation to Hellenistic standards, especially given the popularity of gnomic material in Greek. To some extent the Greek translator of the work aims at this, as discussed by Cook in his study (*Septuagint*) and elaborated upon by d'Hamonville (*Bd'A 17*). It has long been recognised that the translation is written in a semi-literary Greek Koine, in which the translator has not been concerned to represent the Hebrew formally, instead adding expressions and possibly even whole lines, or developing imagery in greater depth (Baumgartner, *Étude*; Gerleman, *Studies*).

The key areas of debate have centred on the setting of Proverbs and on its textual history. As the book has tendencies to vary its wording, and to rephrase and expand its source text, this has led to debate regarding its interpretative character. Some of the choices in wording and the additional phrases could indicate a particular ideology, but this cannot be determined for certain. At the same time the extent of such expansive interpretation is dependent on how far we view differences between the Hebrew and Greek texts as either recensional (that is deriving from a Hebrew *Vorlage* being translated that is different from the MT) or translational (intentional paraphrases and additions by the translator). This is a particular problem in the book of Proverbs, when there are clear additions and a free approach to the source text on the part of the translator. And yet, the LXX also contains recensional doublets that need to be identified, and many additional verses that could be recensional or interpretative. No simple solution can be offered, and each case should be considered on its own terms.

II. Time and Place of Composition

There is no clear evidence for the date of the Greek translation. Cook ('Dating'; *Septuagint*) has suggested that the emphasis on law and ethics, which seem to be themes drawn out even more in the Greek than the Hebrew, reflects a similar cultural background to the book of Ben Sira (early second century B.C.E.). In this he is understanding Ben Sira as a defence against Hellenism at a time when traditional religion was under threat (the same reading as Hengel, *Judaism*), although other readings of Ben Sira are possible (Aitken, 'Biblical'). The emphasis in the translation of Proverbs perhaps means little more than that the author reflects on the sapiential themes of wisdom and instruction. His dating conforms to earlier studies that placed the book sometime in the second century B.C.E. on the basis of its tentative relation to other Septuagint translations, particularly those of Job and Ben Sira, and to the works of *Aristeas* and *Aristobulus*. (For a survey of earlier attempts to date the translation, see Cook, 'Dating', pp. 383–87.) These are nonetheless perhaps to be placed at the end of the second century or later, rather than at the beginning, since the preface to Ben Sira is explicit as to when the translation was made (after 132 or 117 B.C.E.) and *Aristeas* derives from that period.

The translation style, with its rephrasing and variation in equivalents, also appears to be a development of the earlier more formal style of translation seen in the Pentateuch and Minor Prophets.

D'Hamonville has utilised some of the monarchic evidence in Greek Proverbs to enable him to support these earlier proposals for a date, placing it more precisely in the reign of Ptolemy VI Philometor (181–145 B.C.E.). He sees the emphasis on certain topics as suggestive that the translator was close to royal circles and politics in general (cf. d'Hamonville, *Bd'A* 17, p. 25). D'Hamonville proposes that the translator is in fact Aristobulus, said to be the *didaskalos* of a king (2 Macc. 1.10) and to have dedicated his work to a Ptolemy (*Bd'A* 17, p. 137). Philometor's mother had been de facto regent for the years 181–176 B.C.E., and he uses this to account for the expression in Proverbs θεσμούς μητρός σου 'your mother's laws' (Prov. 1.8; 6.20), although it is a natural rendering of the Hebrew there. Proverbs 31.1 is not discussed in this connection by d'Hamonville but may also be significant:

Οἱ ἐμοὶ λόγοι εἴρηγται ὑπὸ θεοῦ,
βασιλέως χρηματισμός, ὃν ἐπαίδευσεν ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ.

My words have been spoken by God;
the decree of a king, whom his mother instructed.

In this passage, the name Lemuel in Hebrew is omitted (perhaps the *-el* termination has been preserved in θεός) and the emphasis is placed on one king. The allusion to the education by the mother might be a covert reference to the name Philometor (cf. Prov. 4.3-4). There certainly seems to be an interest in the education of the monarch in the book, but whether this can be so precisely identified with any one Ptolemy is doubtful. D'Hamonville's suggestion that the author of the translation is Aristobulus also cannot be regarded as certain. What it does indicate, though, is the sort of person who might have translated the book. It would have been someone with a high command of Greek, perhaps with an interest in philosophy, and engaged in the political and social affairs of Jews at the time (cf. § III).

For the location, most assume the provenance of the translation is Egypt. Its connection with other Septuagint translations and even its affinities with *Aristeas* and the translator's ability in Greek would support this. Possible reflections on the Ptolemaic monarchy are also

indicative of this location (d'Hamonville, *Bd'A* 17; Aitken, 'Poet'). Cook seeks to make a case for its provenance being Palestine (Cook and Van der Kooij, *Law*). The particular connections he sees with Ben Sira lead to a setting in Judea, but if those connections are merely thematic, this is less likely. The Hellenistic setting of Egypt and the presence of many of the other LXX translations there would favour an Egyptian or Alexandrian setting.

III. Language

As much as the translator was adept at modifying his translation to express his own interests and emphases, he was clearly adept in the Greek language too. The language of LXX Proverbs reveals the translator to be one who is concerned to convey his message within the appropriate medium and tone for his source text. He is probably aware of the poetic nature of the Hebrew that he was translating, and has chosen vocabulary of a poetic nature. Even if it is sometimes difficult to identify whether a word is poetic or not, it can be still be seen that many of LXX Proverbs' words are distinctive. Some might be attested primarily in poetry, and others might be rare within the language, or at the least might not be the only choice available to the translator within the language.

We begin with Greek particles since these are often omitted in the everyday language of papyri and a distinct decline in their use can be identified (Clarysse, 'Linguistic Diversity'). They are also rare in Septuagint translations, since the paratactic nature of Hebrew (using ו) and the limited number of connectors in Hebrew does not readily lend to literary Greek. Nevertheless, the translator of Proverbs frequently varied his syntax, opting many times for δέ, which disrupts the word order, over καί (e.g., 7.3, 4, 10, 11, 12, 13). He also uses a range of particles from the very opening, seen by Cook as indicative of the translator's creative style (*Septuagint*, pp. 103–104). Chapter 1 is marked by its use of the triple τε (Prov. 1.2-3), a feature known from classical authors too (Denniston, *Particles*, pp. 504–505). In the same chapter τριγαροῦν is repeated in close succession (Prov. 1.26, 31) which shows a particular concern to use particles, even heavy ones. Such close repetition is not typical of Greek, but is attested in a poetic composition from the

Hellenistic era, on a marble stele from Thrace, dated to the mid-second to early first century B.C.E. (Grandjean, *Arétalogie*, ll. 29, 33, 38; see Aitken, *No Stone*, p. 89).

There are some words that are clearly poetic, owing to their use in poetic classical texts and the fact that alternative terms were at the disposal of the translator (see Aitken, ‘Poet’). A good example of this is the noun ὄμμα ‘eye’, which is found in the LXX only in Proverbs (10.26; 23.5) and the ‘literary’ books of 4 Maccabees (5.30; 6.26; 18.21) and Wisdom (11.18; 15.15). The word ὄμμα was the poetic choice for the common prose noun ὀφθαλμός. The use of ὄφις ‘serpent’ (Prov. 23.32; 30.19) might also be such a poetic choice, except that we find it frequently in the LXX (forty times), and there might be other reasons for choosing it (Eynikel and Hauspie, ‘Use’). The Greek βουνός ‘hill’ might also be poetic, although it seems to have come into prose authors in the Hellenistic period. Cook (‘Lexical Matters’) has particularly drawn attention to the many LXX *hapax legomena* that demonstrate the distinctive nature of the translation. It suggests a deliberate attempt by the translator to provide a refined literary work. Among the *hapax legomena* are εἰρηνοποιέω ‘to make peace’ (Prov. 10.10), δυσβάστακτος ‘intolerable’ (27.3), ἀκαρπία ‘unfruitfulness’ (9.12), πραΰθυμος ‘of gentle spirit’ (14.30; 16.19), γλωσσοχαριτέω ‘to flatter’ (28.23), and the relatively rare words ἀμφιτάπης ‘double-sided rug’ (2 Kgdms 17.28; Prov. 7.16) and γλωσσώδης ‘talkative’ (Ps. 139[140].11; Prov. 21.19). The adverb αὐθιμερόν ‘immediately’ (Prov. 12.16; Deut. 24.15) is also not common, although it is found from Aeschylus onwards, and appears in prose authors too. As an alternative to a more common word, the translator chose to use the adjective θνητός ‘mortal’ (3.13; 20.24), occasionally found elsewhere in the LXX, for the expected ἄνθρωπος. The translator of Job by contrast prefers βροτός, although also uses θνητός at Job 30.23. The preference for γονεύς ‘parent’ (Prov. 29.15) might also be dictated by a desire for variation, when the Hebrew merely reads ‘mother’. Finally, the translator of Proverbs was perhaps aiming at a poetic tone in speaking of τάρταρος, ‘the underworld’ (30.16), used in the LXX elsewhere in Job (40.20; 41.24), instead of the expected LXX term of Hades (Gerleman, *Studies*, p. 35).

These lexical samples indicate that the translator aimed at a literary product, even when working within the constraints of a translation. The lexical variation is significant in that it reveals his freedom of choice in selecting his translation equivalents, and that he was willing to opt for an alternative to what might seem an obvious rendering.

It is significant that given this tendency to choose rare or poetic words, the translator is also, as other LXX translators, using the standard Koine of his time. This is apparent in the common words of daily administration, in striking contrast to the literary elements of his translation. That the translator was familiar with some of the language of politics and administration is hardly surprising, but he does employ it much more than many of the other translators. In Prov. 31.1, we find the noun *χρηματισμός* which was a term common in Ptolemaic Egypt to denote a 'decree', 'petition' or any form of legal 'document' or 'report'. The verb *παρεδρεύω* 'to act as assessor' (LSJ 1332) only appears in the LXX in Proverbs with reference to the actions of the figure of Wisdom (1.21; 8.3), but it seems to denote the function of judges in the Hellenistic period. The social context in which the translator lived is reflected in other terms that the translator uses. The king who lacks understanding is defined as a *συκοφάντης* (28.16; also at Ps. 71[72].4), probably recalling the meaning in Ptolemaic papyri of one who practises extortion rather than its older sense of 'informant' or 'denouncer'. A *δωρολήπτης* 'receiver of bribes' (15.27) and an *ἀντίδικος* 'opponent' (18.17) also reflect the social concerns of the time.

Specific political words are also notable in the translation, as discussed briefly by d'Hamonville (*Bd'A* 17, pp. 128–32). The concept of *παρρησία* 'free speech' (1.20; 10.10; 13.5) was important in political thought, and is here associated with Wisdom's openness and public declarations. There is frequent reference to the *βουλή* (1.25, 30; 2.11, 17; 3.21; 8.12, 14; 9.10; 11.13, 14; 15.22; 19.21; 20.5; 21.30; 22.20; 25.28; 31.4) and the *συνέδριον* (11.13; 15.22; 22.10; 24.8; 26.26; 27.22; 31.23). Amongst all this, the role of the king seems to command a special place. The translator sometimes reduces plural references to kings in the Hebrew into the singular, and even has a strophe on the language of the king that is not extant in the MT (24.22).

Within all this freedom and creativity, the translator also opts for odd choices or etymological renderings that would be more familiar from Aquila. Thus, there are a number of words for ‘path, way of life’ in the Hebrew that required translating. For one, מַעַגַל, the translator resorted to ἄξων ‘axle’, used metonymically for the wheel or ‘path’.

IV. Translation and Composition

A precise understanding of the translation technique is dependent upon the approach one takes to the textual variants (cf. § V). It is clear that the translator, through his literary use of Greek, and through variation in the choice of lexical equivalents, did not aim to present all the formal features of the Hebrew. There is occasional paraphrase or expansion too of the source text, so that in many ways it is justifiable to describe the Greek as a Greek composition in its own right. However, variation in translation style and modification of words or phrases is not the same as the addition of whole verses, and freedom in one does not prove freedom in the other. Cook, for example, presumes variants in the Greek in comparison to the Hebrew are explicable as part of the translator’s free rendering of his source (see too Tauberschmidt, *Secondary*). It is unlikely, nevertheless, that large sections of pluses are to be attributed to the translator rather than an alternative *Vorlage* (cf. Fox, ‘LXX-Proverbs’, p. 97). The translator was creative but did not necessarily depart from his source to a large degree.

In similar fashion there is a transposition in sections in the manuscripts that could be the work of the translator but more likely arose during the transmission history (§ V). Cook has argued that in Proverbs this was an intentional restructuring (*Septuagint*, pp. 312–15), creating contrasts between topics. Certainly, the juxtaposition of the theme of kingship in Prov. 25.1-7 after 31.1-9 does have the effect of drawing attention to issues regarding the proper behaviour of the monarch (cf. Aitken, ‘Poet’), but this could be accidental.

Unsurprisingly the translator was sensitive to the stylistic and rhetorical effects of his Greek and many poetic devices have been identified (Gerleman, *Studies*, pp. 11–35; d’Hamonville, *Bd’A* 17, pp. 87–101). We need not go as far as Thackeray (‘Poetry’) and identify a regular use of metre in the translation, but recognise standard features of Greek style.

V. Key Text-Critical Issues

There are two extant Qumran manuscripts (4Q102 and 4Q103), but both are fragmentary and not of great assistance. They seem to display close affinities to the MT indicating that the form of the MT is early. A quotation in 4Q271 5.1.14-15 (CD 11.20-21) echoes Prov. 15.8, although the wording is different from the MT. Many scholars see the differences between MT and LXX of Proverbs as recensional (Tov, 'Recensional'), although others have argued for exegetical expansions on the part of the translator. Fox ('LXX-Proverbs') takes a wise middle position by examining each case in turn, allowing for some expansion but also finding arguments for many of the variants to have arisen in the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the translation. He sees LXX Proverbs as a translation of a base text that deviated from MT both in terms of arrangement and content. The reconstructed Hebrew base text is described as a 'recension' of the book of Proverbs on a par with MT Proverbs. The Peshitta offers some assistance, although it neither witnesses directly to either the Hebrew or Greek, while the Targum is largely dependent on the Peshitta (Owens, 'Relationship').

A major re-arrangement of verses in the Greek translation results in the placement of 30.1-14 after 24.22 and 30.15-31.9 after 24.34. As a result the verses appear (using the Hebrew verse numbering) in the following order (cf. Cook, *Septuagint*, pp. 293-96):

1.1-24.22
30.1-14
24.23-34
25-29
30.15-33
31.1-9
31.10-31

The section 30.15-33 follows 24.23-34, which includes the directions to a king on the proper use of the tongue and the reference to Wisdom sitting by the gates of princes. It closes with the addressee (the king?) being admonished for not paying heed to Wisdom's words. While the phenomenon of rearranged verses in Greek can happen, as it does in all the Greek witnesses to Sirach between chs. 33 and 36 where fascicle leaves were probably rearranged in an early codex resulting in a

transposition of Sir. 30.25–33.13a and 33.13b–36.16a, the case in Proverbs seems to be different. The portions of text which have been rearranged are normally identified in the Hebrew as independent sections: hence, they were more likely displaced in Hebrew rather than in Greek, where the translator seeks to ascribe to Solomon all the sections. Here in Proverbs we have the displacement of two short portions of text which hardly could stand alone in two whole fascicles. Therefore in Proverbs it likely has arisen in the Hebrew *Vorlage* rather than from exegesis on the part of the translator.

Although at the Septuaginta Unternehmen in Göttingen a collation of the manuscripts of the book of Proverbs has been in preparation since the 1950s, a major critical edition has not yet been published. This lack certainly affects our knowledge of the LXX of Proverbs. Some studies on the manuscripts have been undertaken by Schildenberger (*Die altlateinischen texte*, vol. I, esp. pp. 23–54), Zuntz ('Der Antinoe Papyrus'), Bady ('Le commentaire', pp. 37–75) and Moro ('Il testo'). The latter three also had the opportunity to consult the collation in Göttingen. However, an exhaustive study on the partition of the manuscripts is lacking. Since the codices tend to share the same textual type in the same group of books (Octateuch, other historical books, sapiential books, prophetic books), the divisions established by Joseph Ziegler for Wisdom, Sirach and especially Ecclesiastes (Ziegler, 'Gebrauch', pp. 109–10) may be of some help. As in Ecclesiastes, the subgroups 106–130 and 336–728 usually agree with each other. They may agree also with MS V and the Syro-Hexaplar, but often (and more frequently 336–728) they may show peculiar readings which realign the text with the Hebrew, or represent a stylistic improvement. MS 637, which in Ecclesiastes belongs to the Hexaplaric group, and in Wisdom belongs to the Antiochian group, randomly agrees with the aforementioned manuscripts. The same happens to MS 613. By contrast MS 253, which elsewhere is clearly Hexaplaric, does not show a special agreement with these manuscripts.

The omission in Vaticanus (B) of lines 2.21a-b (sub ÷ in Syh) indicates the influence of the Hexaplaric recension even on our best manuscript for the book of Proverbs. The removal of the doublet under obeli may be at best explained if we admit that the tradition on which B depends, when confronted with the striking similarity of the distichs,

decided to set out the lines under obeli, because it considered them spurious. In the same way B* excludes v. 2.3c (sub ✕ pro ÷ in Syh), and v. 8.10c (> Syh). Interestingly enough, another doublet which exhibits θ 's translation technique, 2.2b-c (line c sub ÷ in Syh), shows fewer similarities than those found in 2.3b-c; 2.21; 8.10b-c, and is fully preserved by B. An earlier insertion related to the recensional work of the *kaige* group would conveniently explain the textual data of B, the lack of the asterisks in the Syro-Hexapla, and would confirm that the pedantic doublet in 2.21c-d does not depend on Origen's activity.

As the edition of Rahlfs-Hanhart demonstrates, Codices S and A also may often preserve rare and original readings. Besides the three fundamental majuscule manuscripts, specific attention may be accorded to MSS V 106 130 336 728 which alone preserve the order of the chapters according to the MT. This is a variant reading on the macroscopic level which makes one suspect that these manuscripts may be good witnesses to the Hexaplaric text.

Concerning the Antiochian recension, the subfamilies 106-130 and 336-728, separately, happen to exhibit, as mentioned above, peculiar readings which might underlie this text type. Regarding this debated subject, Bady ('La méthode', pp. 319–27) claims that MS Patmiacus gr. 161, which alone preserves the still unpublished *Commentary on the Book of Proverbs* attributed to John Chrysostom, is the better witness to the Lucianic text.¹ He explains, in his unfortunately still unpublished doctoral thesis, that the Patmiacus codex shows 600 variant readings ('Le commentaire', pp. 44–46). According to Bady, the closest biblical manuscript to the Patmiacus would be V (150 common variants), immediately followed by 336 (123 common variants), the Syro-Hexapla version (106 common variants) and 728 (104 common variants). Prudent skepticism is advised on the survival, for the book of Proverbs, of an Antiochian recension, although it is clear, both from Schildenberger's and Bady's studies (*Proverbien*, pp. 35–40, 126–31; 'Le commentaire', pp. 37–75), that a cluster of manuscripts shows a randomising agreement around the text exhibited by the Antiochian Fathers, namely John Chrysostom and Theodoret of Cyrus.

1. Bady, 'méthode exégétique', p. 320: 'le texte biblique que commente l'auteur est de type lucianique: le Patmiacus gr. 161 en est même sans doute le meilleur témoin pour les Proverbes'.

As far as the versions are concerned, the Pre-Nicene translations, namely the *Vetus Afrā* and the Coptic (especially the Sahidic), prove to occasionally preserve² readings which are lost in the Greek tradition. These readings may sometimes represent a different Hebrew *Vorlage*. The fact is well known, and has been already documented for other books of the Old Testament (Van der Kooij, ‘Place’, p. 72; Fernández Marcos, ‘Textual Context’, p. 419). After the destruction of the holy books which took place under the Emperor Diocletian’s persecution, the LXX textual patrimony was not fully preserved. Under Constantine and his successors the LXX text reached a stability and a uniformity partially witnessed by the later versions (Armenian, Ethiopic, Syro-Palestinian, Syro-Hexapla), which seem to be more helpful for locating a Greek textual type than for uncovering variants lacking in the Greek tradition.

VI. Ideology and Exegesis

As already indicated, determining the extent of the translator’s exegesis is dependent on one’s attitude to the textual situation (§§ IV and V). Although some have seen a philosophical stratum in the translation, Cook is probably correct not to emphasise this. There are nonetheless moralising additions in the text, seen for example in the addition of *κακός* ‘bad’ or *δίκαιος* ‘righteous’ to reinforce the message of the text (Dick, ‘Ethics’), and these are similar to Greek gnomic material. In his many publications Cook has sketched a picture of a document that is religiously conservative, and although highly Hellenised in its language is restrained if not polemical towards Hellenism (cf. § II). As typical of the translator’s Hellenistic education Cook even points to the use of Aristotle by the translator in a proverb on the ant and the bee (Prov. 6.6-8) deriving from Aristotle’s *History of Animals* 622B. The Greek adds to the saying about an ant one about a bee, although once more we cannot be certain if this is recensional or original to the translator, or even to the later transmission of the Greek. Despite this, the translator is restrained

2. As in Prov. 14.22 (ἔλεον – ἀγαθοί] *miseri cordes bonorum cogitatores sunt* Lat⁹⁴ Sa), and in the additional stich found in Prov. 8.31 (ἀνθρώπων] + *thesauri autem eius faciunt homines gaudibundos* Lat⁹⁴ Sa Ach BodVI 928?).

towards the Hellenistic world. Cook rightly draws attention to the sharpening of the moral language and to an emphasis on Torah, the law of Moses. At the same time it downplays foreign elements in the text.

The understanding of Hellenism as a threat in ancient Judaism has now been disputed in scholarship (see Gruen, *Heritage*), and we might view the translator differently. He was living in a Hellenistic world, and naturally sharpened what was already in his source, but in that sense he was bound by his source text. Ethics and proper behaviour was not an adverse theme in a Greek world and it would be better to locate the translator within a Hellenistic environment (cf. *Bd'A* 17). Cook's work does, nonetheless, highlight the many themes that the translator chose to emphasise.

VII. Reception History

Proverbs was clearly a popular text in antiquity, and the gnomic expressions could be used in a range of contexts. Identification of a precise reference as opposed to thematic similarity is, however, difficult. An obvious source that would likely use Proverbs is Ps.-Phocylides, composed as it is of Greek gnomic material that probably derives from a Jewish author but had a circulation and was preserved in Christianity (see Van der Horst, *Sentences*; Wilson, *Sentences*). The difficulty with Ps.-Phocylides is that his writing has reshaped any source into the author's own wording, with the consequence that no one sentence can be said to be an allusion to a biblical passage, although many might ultimately derive from the Bible (see Wilson, *Sentences*, pp. 17–18, who lists the most likely parallels). There are sentences that reflect Proverbs, such as on the beggar (Ps-Phoc. 22-23) that can be compared to Prov. 3.27-28. And yet it is difficult to dissociate common Greek gnomic material from genuine biblical allusion. A similar proverb on the ant and the bee (Prov. 6.6-8) appears in Ps-Phoc. 164-174 in a discussion of the industriousness of the ants and the bees. The source is often taken to be LXX Proverbs (Van der Horst, *Sentences*, pp. 222–25). Nevertheless, such proverbial creatures are common, found in various types of wisdom literature including Sir. 11.3 and in Greek literature (see Giese, 'Strength').

Philo of Alexandria draws on works other than the Pentateuch far less, and only seems to draw on Proverbs four times, if not always in direct

quotation (Cohen, 'Earliest', p. 239): *Ebr.* 84 (Prov. 1.8; 3.4; 4.3), *Congr.* 177 (Prov. 3.11, 12); *Suppl. Gen.* IV 129 (Prov. 19.14) and *Ebr.* 31 (8.22-23). In similar fashion to Philo and Ps.-Phocylides, the New Testament reflects passages similar to Proverbs (see N-A 28, pp. 757–58), but few seem to be dependent on the text or quote it explicitly. Proverbs 3.11-12 appears to be the source of Heb. 12.5-6, but since the Greek vocabulary is so different the author is not necessarily drawing on the LXX version as we know it. There are clear cases, nevertheless, of correspondences in phrases and vocabulary, such as in Jas 4.6 (Prov. 3.34; cf. 1 Pet. 5.5) and 1 Pet. 4.18 (Prov. 11.31).

There are some correspondences between the book of Wisdom and Proverbs (see too Wisdom of Solomon § III), such as the portrayal of Wisdom in Wis. 6.9-16 deriving from Proverbs 1 and 8. Gerleman (*Studies*, p. 59) suggests that LXX Prov. 1.21, the image of Wisdom as a *πάρεδρος* at the (city) gates, undoubtedly influences Wisdom 6, especially as the addressees in this part of the book of Wisdom are the rulers (6.9, *ὧ τύραννοι*). The verse in Wisdom is not a translation of the Hebrew, but appears to be an adaptation of the Greek.

Jewish inscriptions are particularly illuminating for the reception of LXX Proverbs, even among Jews of late antiquity. By far the most popular biblical verse in Jewish inscriptions is the frequent quotation in epitaphs of Prov. 10.7, a text that differs in the Greek from the Hebrew: *μνήμη δικαίων μετ' ἔγκωμίων, ὄνομα δὲ ἀσεβοῦς σβέννυται* 'The memory of the righteous ones is with praises, but the name of the wicked is extinguished'. In the recensional history of this verse, there are two main variants that allow us to identify in inscriptions which tradition is being followed. In place of the plural *δικαίων* it is recorded that *hoi loipoi* read the singular *δικαίου* in line with the Hebrew, and for the Hebrew *לְבַרְכָּה*, where the LXX has *μετ' ἔγκωμίων* 'with praises', Aquila translated the Hebrew more accurately as *εἰς εὐλογίαν* 'for a blessing'. What we find in some inscriptions is that there was an awareness of the LXX version using *μετ' ἔγκωμίων* 'with praises' in epitaphs and sometimes the plural 'righteous', as well as an awareness of Aquila's reading ('for a blessing'), which matches the Hebrew (see further Cappelletti, 'Biblical Quotations'). We thus find a continuing use for some time of the Greek version, if only through the memory of one phrase, even among Jews.

Bibliography

- Aitken, J.K., 'Biblical Interpretation as Political Manifesto: The Seleucid Setting of the Wisdom of Ben Sira', *JJS* 51 (2000), pp. 191–208.
- 'Jewish Use of Greek Proverbs', in N. de Lange, C. Boyd-Taylor and J.G. Krivoruchko (eds.), *Jewish Reception of Greek Bible Versions* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), pp. 53–77.
- No Stone Unturned: Greek Inscriptions and Septuagint Vocabulary* (CSHB; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2014).
- 'Poet and Critic: Royal Ideology and the Greek Translator of Proverbs', in T. Rajak, S. Pearce, J. Aitken and J. Dines (eds.), *Jewish Perspectives on Hellenistic Rulers* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007), pp. 190–204.
- Bady, G., 'Le commentaire inédit sur les proverbes attribué à Jean Chrysostome. Introduction, édition critique et traduction' (Ph.D. dissertation, Université de Lyon 2, 2003).
- 'La méthode exégétique du Commentaire inédit sur les Proverbes attribué à Jean Chrysostome', *Studia Patristica* 37 (2001), pp. 319–27.
- Baumgartner, A.J., *Étude critique sur l'état du texte du livre des Proverbes d'après les principales traductions anciennes* (Leipzig: Imprimerie orientale W. Drugulin, 1890).
- Cappelletti, S., 'Biblical Quotations in Greek Jewish Inscriptions of the Diaspora', in N. de Lange, C. Boyd-Taylor and J.G. Krivoruchko (eds.), *Jewish Reception of Greek Bible Versions* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), pp. 128–41.
- Clarysse, W., 'Linguistic Diversity in the Archive of the Engineers Kleon and Theodoros', in T.V. Evans and D. Obbink (eds.), *The Language of Papyri* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), pp. 35–50.
- Cohen, N.G., 'Earliest Evidence of the Haftarah Cycle for the Sabbaths between the 17th of *Tammuz* and *Sukkoth* in Philo', *JJS* 48 (1997), pp. 225–49.
- Cook, J., 'The Dating of Septuagint Proverbs', *ETL* 69 (1993), pp. 383–99.
- 'Lexical Matters in LXX Proverbs', *JNSL* 26 (2000), pp. 163–73.
- The Septuagint of Proverbs: Jewish and/or Hellenistic Proverbs? Concerning the Hellenistic Colouring of LXX Proverbs* (VTSup 69; Leiden: Brill, 1997).
- Cook, J., and A. van der Kooij, *Law, Prophets, and Wisdom: On the Provenance of Translators and Their Books in the Septuagint Version* (CBET 68; Leuven: Peeters, 2012).
- Denniston, J.D., *The Greek Particles* (2nd ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1954).
- Dick, M.B., 'The Ethics of the Old Greek Book of Proverbs', *Studia Philonica Annual* 2 (1991), pp. 20–50.
- d'Hamonville, D.-M. (ed.), *La Bible d'Alexandrie*. Vol. XVII, *Les Proverbes* (Paris: Cerf, 2000).

- Eynikel, E., and K. Hauspie, 'The Use of *δράκων* in the Septuagint', in B.A. Taylor, J.A.L. Lee, P.R. Burton and R.E. Whitaker (eds.), *Biblical Greek Language and Lexicography* (Festschrift Frederick W. Danker; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), pp. 126–35.
- Fernández Marcos, N., 'The Textual Context of the Hexapla: Lucianic Texts and Vetus Latina', in A. Salvesen, *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), pp. 408–20.
- Fox, M.V., 'LXX-Proverbs as a Text-Critical Resource', *Textus* 22 (2005), pp. 95–128.
- Gerleman, G., *Studies in the Septuagint III: Proverbs* (Lunds Universiteits Årsskrift, 1.52.3; Lund: Gleerup, 1956).
- Giese, R.L., 'Strength through Wisdom and the Bee in LXX-Prov 6,8a-c', *Bib* 73 (1992), pp. 404–11.
- Grandjean, Y., *Une nouvelle Arétalogie d'Isis à Maronée* (Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'Empire romain 49; Leiden: Brill, 1975).
- Gruen, E.S., *Heritage and Hellenism: The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998).
- Hengel, M., *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period* (2 vols.; London: SCM, 1974).
- Horst, P.W. van der, *The Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides: With Introduction and commentary* (Leiden: Brill, 1978).
- Kooij, A. van der, 'On the Place of Origin of the Old Greek of Psalms', *VT* 33 (1983), pp. 67–74.
- Moro, C., 'Il testo greco di "Proverbi" in Clemente Alessandrino. Analisi testuale e confronto con la versione copto-saïdica', *Annali di studi religiosi* 2 (2001), pp. 391–437.
- Owens, R.J., 'The Relationship between the Targum and Peshitta Texts of the Book of Proverbs: "status quaestionis"', *Targum Studies* 2 (1998), pp. 195–207.
- Schildenberger, J., *Die altlateinischen texte des Proverbien-Buches* (Beuron: Erzabtei Beuron, 1941).
- Tauberschmidt, G., *Secondary Parallelism: A Study of Translation Technique in LXX Proverbs* (SBL Academia biblica 15; Leiden: Brill, 2004).
- Thackeray, H.St.J., 'The Poetry of the Greek Book of Proverbs', *JTS* 13 (1912), pp. 46–66.
- Tov, E., 'Recensional Differences between the Masoretic Text and the Septuagint of Proverbs', in H.W. Attridge *et al.* (eds.), *Of Scribes and Scrolls: Studies on the Hebrew Bible, Intertestamental Judaism, and Christian Origins, Presented to John Strugnell* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1990), pp. 43–56.
- Wilson, W.T., *The Mysteries of Righteousness: The Literary Composition and Genre of the Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994).
- The Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2005).
- Ziegler, J., 'Der Gebrauch des Artikels in der Septuaginta des Ecclesiastes', in D. Fraenkel, U. Quast and J.W. Wevers (eds.), *Studien zur Septuaginta* (Festschrift Robert Hanhart; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990), pp. 83–120.
- Zuntz, G., 'Der Antioe Papyrus der Proverbia und das Prophetologion', *ZAW* 68 (1956), pp. 124–84.

Ecclesiastes

James K. Aitken

Editions

(a) Standard Greek Editions

Göttingen (currently in preparation; ed. Gentry).
Rahlfs-Hanhart, vol. II, pp. 238–60.
Swete, vol. II, pp. 480–505.

(b) Other Greek Editions

Die alttestamentlichen Texte des Papyrus bilinguis I (Diebner and Kasser, 1989).

(c) Modern Translations

NETS (Gentry, 2007), pp. 648–56.
LXX.D (Backhaus, 2009), pp. 978–97.
Bd'A 18 (Vinel, 2002).

I. General Characteristics

The translation of Ecclesiastes can be described as presenting a high degree of quantitative and lexical equivalence. The translator aims to find an equivalent in Greek for every element in Hebrew, to match verbs, nouns and adjectives of apparently the same root with Greek words sharing the same root, and to follow the same word order. This translation style, coupled with the use of certain words, has led some to see it as the work of the second-century Jewish reviser Aquila, who reflected similar techniques. It has been shown (Hyvärinen, *Die Übersetzung*, pp. 89–99; Jarick, ‘Aquila’s Koheleth’), however, that the vocabulary

does not always correspond to Aquila's, and that Origen's Hexapla contained a different version under the heading of Aquila. It is therefore thought that the translation of Ecclesiastes is a developed form of the *kaige*-Theodotion tradition, to be situated sometime between the appearance of *kaige* in the first century B.C.E. and Aquila in the second century C.E. This places it among the latest if not the very latest of the Septuagint books to be translated.

The reason why this translation technique was employed has been subject to debate. The high degree of interference has been attributed either to a desire to prioritise the Hebrew at a time of early rabbinic revival of Hebrew or to a method for teaching Hebrew. The high level of equivalence does not permit ready conclusions to be drawn from the method, and attempts to relate parts to rabbinic exegetical techniques have been questioned (Grabbe, 'Aquila's Translation'). Attention to the subtleties of the Greek offers clues to the setting and purpose of the translation, but few definitive conclusions can be drawn.

II. Time and Place of Composition

Opinions on the setting of the translation have been posited on the basis of its relation to Aquila and to rabbinic methods of exegesis. Barthélemy (*Les devanciers*), drawing upon suggestions of earlier scholars (e.g., Taylor, 'Preface', p. v), places the translation method within the early rabbinic tradition (see § IV), which would imply a date in Palestine during the Roman period (first to second century C.E.). Traditions about Aquila, who for some is behind this translation, also situate that translator in Palestine. Evidence for a location cannot be conclusive but there are some points in favour of a Palestinian location. The close adherence to the Hebrew text could be a feature of a Palestinian school that favoured or placed priority on the Hebrew text. This has also been seen for the *kaige* tradition, especially when the *kaige* scroll of the Minor Prophets has been found in Palestine (Naḥal Ḥever, Judean desert). The later the translation is placed in the Roman period, the more likely it would be in Palestine, since gradually after the Roman conquest of Egypt Alexandria declined as a centre of Greek learning, to be overshadowed by places like Pergamum and Jerusalem.

Dillmann ('griechischer Qohelet') proposed that the LXX version is a revision of an older Greek translation, which would complicate the dating and identify the current LXX version as a revision. There is no evidence, however, of an earlier translation before the current LXX version, although this is not decisive. We do have examples of translations that have been entirely replaced by later ones, leaving little trace of an earlier version. This can be seen in those places where a *kaige* version has replaced the Old Greek version, such as in parts of Samuel–Kings (LXX Kingdoms) or in Daniel, where the surviving version within the Septuagint is the later version of Theodotion but an OG version has been identified too. The difference from Ecclesiastes, though, is that the Syrohexaplar of Daniel is also based on OG, such that its existence was known. Furthermore, the Church Fathers were aware that in Daniel an earlier version had been replaced by that of Theodotion, and Jerome was able to comment on both (*Preface to Daniel*). The situation is quite different in Ecclesiastes where there is no trace of an OG version, so that we have no case for proposing an earlier version.

The similarity of the version to the translation technique of Aquila (§ IV) implies it is close to the time of that translator (second century C.E.). As the translation does not reflect all the features, and especially the vocabulary, of Aquila, it probably should be placed before his time. Nonetheless, it is to be differentiated from all other LXX books in the extent of the development of the *kaige* tradition and stands apart from them. The translation is distinctive in its degree of consistent lexical equivalence, the regular use of *καίτε* more than any other LXX book, and the use of *σύν* for *καί* as direct object marker, uniquely in the LXX. It is therefore highly likely that it is the latest and most developed in technique of the translations, and from a significant time later than the *kaige* tradition (conventionally dated from the end of the first century B.C.E.). The proposal that LXX Ecclesiastes could be first century B.C.E. is improbable (Meade and Gentry, 'Evaluating', pp. 211–12), and is dependent on estimating a century time lapse for each scribal error (see § V). At the earliest it should be placed in the first century C.E., with a *terminus ad quem* of Aquila in the early second. This dating could be supported by the language (§ III) in which we find many neologisms or words only attested after a certain date (cf. Aitken, 'Neologisms'), and syntax and orthography (e.g., *οὐδέεις*, Eccl. 3.19, in contrast to *οὐθείς*) that might reflect changes in the Roman period (Aitken, 'Phonological').

III. Language

The influence of the translation technique on the Greek of the translation means the interpretation of the language will always be provisional. Lexical features are easier to discuss. Standard Koine words are found, with only occasional literary or poetic features (though see § IV). Words attested in Koine but not in earlier literary works include *ἀντίρρησις* ‘refutation’ (8.11), *δόκωσις* ‘roofing’ (10.18), *κολυμβήθρα* ‘pool’ (Eccl. 2.6), *σαγήνη* ‘fishing net’ (7.26), *ὑστέρημα* ‘lacking’ (1.15) and *χάραξ* ‘bulwark’ (9.14). Words of a literary nature are few: *νέφος* ‘cloud’ (11.3; 12.2) as a poetic alternative to *νεφέλη* is a rare exception, probably chosen for the sake of variation (cf. *νεφέλη* in 11.4). Particles are extremely rare, the standard equivalent being *καί* for *waw*. The complete absence of *δέ* and the one appearance of *γάρ* (McNeile, *Introduction*, p. 160; Salters, ‘Observations’, p. 167) are examples of how the Greek literary style has been disregarded in favour of the Hebrew. The use of *ὅπως* in addition to *ἵνα* is striking when a distinct decline can be traced in the use of *ὅπως* up to modern Greek where *ὅπως* is not used at all. Already in the Hellenistic period there is noticeable decrease in the use of *ὅπως*, confirmed by papyri where *ὅπως*, owing to the rarity of its appearance, has been noted as a marker of register (Clarysse, ‘Linguistic Diversity’, pp. 43–45).

Ecclesiastes stands apart from other Septuagint books in its range of vocabulary. Of the estimated 631 words in Ecclesiastes, at least 37 are *hapax legomena* within the Septuagint, and of these at least 16 could be said to be neologisms (Aitken, ‘Neologisms’): *ἀνθέμιον* ‘flower’ (Eccl. 12.6), *βούκεντρον* ‘ox-goad’ (12.11), *δόκωσις* ‘roofing’ (10.18), *ἔντριτος* ‘third’ (4.12), *ἐντρύφημα* ‘delight’ (2.8), *ἐπικραταίωμα* ‘to prevail’ (4.12), *κόπωσις* ‘weariness’ (12.12), *κόσμιον* ‘ornament’ (12.9), *ὀκνηρία* ‘hesitation’ (10.18), *ὀχληρία* ‘annoyance’ (7.25), *περασμός* ‘end’ (4.8, 16; 12.12), *περίλημψις* ‘embracing’ (3.5), *περισσειά* ‘abundance’ (1.3, etc.), *πληροφορέω* ‘to be fully set on’ (8.11), *σύναγμα* ‘collection’ (12.11), *συντροχάζω* ‘to run together’ (12.6). Undoubtedly some could be inventions of the translator (such as *βούκεντρον* or the compound *συντροχάζω*), but many are simply not attested in the surviving records. They demonstrate if nothing else that the translator was independent of his predecessors in his choice of vocabulary and did not seek classical literary terms in his composition. Some words are only attested in late

sources: βλαστᾶω ‘to sprout’, late form of βλαστάνω (Eccl. 2.6), ἔγκοπος ‘weary’ (Eccl. 1.8; Job 19.2; Isa 43.23), δρᾶξ ‘hand’ (Eccl. 4.6), ζῶοποιέω ‘to give life’ (Eccl. 7.12).

Much of the syntax of the translation has been analysed in Yi’s detailed study of the translation technique of Ecclesiastes (‘Translation Technique’). It is difficult to determine how far the syntax is representative of the language of the time or how far it arises from interference through adherence to the source text. One example will illustrate the potential of a study of the syntax, with due attention to the possibility of interference. The employment of the subjunctive for future becomes a feature of Greek in the Roman period (Costas, *An Outline*, p. 68), and seems to be attested in LXX Ecclesiastes. In Ecclesiastes, for example, the subjunctive can follow a future or vice versa (3.13; 9.15; 12.5, 7), indicating that the future and subjunctive might be equivalent. The decline in the infinitive and its replacement by ἵνα plus subjunctive (eventually resolving into Modern Greek να) is also attested in Ecclesiastes (5.14, ἵνα πορευθῆ). The expression ἐποίησεν ἵνα φοβηθῶσιν (Eccl. 3.14) might also be indicative of this and be contrasted with the similar construction in Job (ἀλγεῖν ποιεῖ), where the infinitive is employed. A development in the language seems to have occurred from the expression in Job to its employment in Ecclesiastes.

IV. Translation and Composition

Consistent word order that corresponds to the Hebrew word order is maintained throughout, with only occasional variation (e.g., γάρ, 5.15). Likewise Hebrew words are for the most part always rendered by the same word in Greek, and cognate verbs, nouns and adjectives rendered by cognates in Greek. Thus, συναντάω and the rare word συνάντημα, for example, translate the root *qrh*, and ὄραμα, ὄρασις and ὀράω all render the root *rʰh*. Quantitative equivalence is maintained, matching the same number of elements in Greek as those in Hebrew. As an example, the articular infinitive was an ideal grammatical construction to allow the translator to provide an equivalent for the prefix in the Hebrew infinitive, where the simple Greek infinitive would not have sufficed: וַיַּעַל rendered by τοῦ περισπᾶσθαι (1.13). There is variation in the rendering of the relative clause, but in each case an equivalent is given for the Hebrew

(-ש or שר): τὸ ποιηθησόμενον (1.9), ὁ ποιήσουσιν (2.3), ἵνα φοβηθῶσιν (3.14). There is also a reasonably consistent matching of gender, so that a distinction is drawn between the translation of קבר by τάφος (8.10) on the one hand,¹ and קברה by ταφή (6.3) on the other. Similarly there is the consistent separation between the translation of טוב by ἀγαθός (in all 45 occurrences of the Hebrew), and the translation of טובה by ἀγαθωσύνη (in all seven occurrences).

Despite such careful attention to every detail of the Hebrew, the translator reveals a sensitivity and appreciation for Greek that would seem to contradict the strict translation technique. Throughout the book there are rhetorical devices not dependent on the Hebrew source text that suggest a concern for the sound of the Hebrew (see further Vinel, *Bd'A* 18, pp. 46–47; Aitken, 'Rhetoric'). This might be seen in the choice of the noun ματαιότης that produces the iambic ματαιότης ματαιοτήτων 'vanity of vanities' (1.12), a tragic rhythm. It is seen in the rendering of the relative clause by a participle to produce alliteration on such phrases as πάντα τὰ ποιήματα τὰ πεποιημένα 'all the things done' (1.14a-b). Finally a range of other devices can be identified, including *homoioteleuton* (11.9), variation of words (νέφος and νεφέλη 'cloud', 11.3; 12.2), variation of forms (ὅτι...διότι 6.8; σκοτίζω and σκοτάζω (12.2-3) and coordination of compound adjectives (συν-, 12.6). In order to achieve some affects the translator departs from his own consistent technique. In Eccl. 3.8 the verbs καιρὸς τοῦ φιλεῖν καὶ καιρὸς τοῦ μισῆναι 'A time to love and a time to hate' create *homoioteleuton* of the endings φιλεῖν and μισῆναι, although elsewhere in Ecclesiastes the Hebrew verb באה is translated by ἀγαπάω (5.9 *bis*; 9.9) rather than φιλέω. Nevertheless, φιλέω contains the same vowels as μισέω, and the resulting isocolon in 3.8 of φιλεῖν and μισῆναι accounts for the divergence from the normal translation equivalent of ἀγαπάω.

The features of precise quantitative equivalence and consistent lexical renderings are typical of the *kaije* tradition and comes closest to the method of Aquila (as argued by Barthélemy), who even showed similar literary pretension amid the extreme equivalence (Hyvärinen, *Übersetzung*, p. 86). Most distinctive of all are two equivalences that are

1. The translator has read קברים as a noun, although it is vocalised as a verb in the MT (see Goldman, 'Qoheleth', p. 100*).

associated especially with Aquila and likewise arise from a care to represent in Greek everything that is in the Hebrew. The first is the rendering of the Hebrew conjunction ׀ג and ׀ג׀ by καί γε (later written as one word καίγε), which produces two equivalents for the two Hebrew words, including a possible phonetic match (׀ג ~ γε). This is a feature of many books in the *kaige* tradition, but in Ecclesiastes it is far more frequent and consistent than in any other LXX translation. Hebrew ׀ג is so rendered on 43 occasions and ׀ג׀ on 14 occasions (cf. Gentry, *NETS*, p. 649). The one other book that is consistent in its rendering of ׀ג by καί γε is Lamentations (in six instances). The second feature is the equation of the Hebrew direct object marker תא with the preposition תא meaning ‘with’, thereby rendering both Hebrew words by the same Greek preposition σύν. However, σύν is only chosen where תא is followed by the definite article or כל, or where a detached pronoun follows (Burkitt, *Fragments*, p. 12; cf. Swete, *Intro.*, pp. 38–41). Where there is no definite article, such as in the case of the Hebrew construct state, תא itself is rendered by the mere Greek definite article. Thereby quantitative equivalence is maintained. Ziegler divides the renderings of תא in Ecclesiastes into eight groups (‘Wiedergabe’), although the data may be summarised more simply (Yi, ‘Translation Technique’, pp. 69–74). There are some 36 uses of σύν as this translation equivalent in Ecclesiastes, the majority followed by the accusative, but also by the genitive and dative. In fact, σύν appears to be independent of the syntax, and the case of the following nouns is determined by the verb. The preposition has therefore been identified as adverbial, imitating Homeric Greek (Klostermann, *De libri*, p. 42; Barthélemy, *Les devanciers*, p. 16); if so, it would be a further indicator of sensitivity to literary Greek and a knowledge of Homer.

Similarities between LXX Ecclesiastes and Aquila had been suspected for some time, but it is Graetz who is to be attributed with their full identification (Graetz, *Kohélet*, pp. 173–79). The focus of the discussion had been on the use of σύν for תא as direct object marker, which, as already noted, is distinctive to Ecclesiastes within the LXX. The difficulty with such an identification of the translator as Aquila is that material attributed to Aquila from the Hexapla also exists, but differs from LXX Ecclesiastes. Hence scholars came to posit the LXX version as either Aquila’s first or his second version. This debate has now been circumvented by the study of Hyvärinen (*Übersetzung*, pp. 89–99), who showed


that the LXX version of Ecclesiastes did not correspond to the vocabulary of Aquila, and therefore should not be seen as the work of Aquila. To take one obvious example, Aquila translated לִבָּהּ (1.2) as ἀτμίς to convey its sense of ‘mist’ in contrast to the LXX’s ματαιότης ‘vanity’. Meanwhile Jarick was able to show that the version attributed to Aquila in the Hexapla is indeed the work of Aquila (‘Aquila’s Koheleth’). In a renewed quest for the identity of the translator, both Gentry (‘Relationship’) and Yi (‘Translation Technique’, pp. 357–422) have drawn attention to lexical correspondences with Theodotion and suggested that the translator might be more in the line of Theodotion. It seems clear that the translator of Ecclesiastes has affinities with later translation traditions and can be placed somewhere on the scale between *kaige* and the second-century revisers. He perhaps should be seen as an individual within that tradition, and one distinct from and independent of much of the LXX itself.

V. Key Text-Critical Issues

The advantage of the precise translation method is that it allows for easy reconstruction of the *Vorlage* of the translation and for identification of obvious errors in the Greek. However, there were some small differences between the *Vorlage* that the translator had before him and the current MT. This means that Rahlfs-Hanhart, on which we must base any study until the publication of Gentry’s Göttingen edition, sometimes chooses readings on the basis of the MT rather than on the best Greek witnesses. Rahlfs-Hanhart is also problematic where Rahlfs retroverts what he calls *vetus latina* into Greek. This Latin version is in fact Jerome’s translation of the Hebrew, and therefore not a witness to an early Greek form (Goldman, ‘Qoheleth’, p. 15*).

Two manuscripts are extant dating from before the time of the major codices of the fourth century (Sinaiticus and Vaticanus). PMich.inv. 27 (along with Milan, Università Cattolica P. Med. 151) are fragments containing portions of Eccl. 3.17-18, 21-22, and 6.3-5 (Rahlfs 0818). It is listed as third century by Rahlfs (*Verzeichnis*, pp. 6–7), although when it was published the date was tentatively given as the end of the third or the beginning of the fourth centuries (Roca Puig, ‘PMed. Inv. n. 151’, p. 215). From the same time period is a Greek version of Ecclesiastes in

the Hamburg papyrus, a bilingual Greek–Coptic version of the Old Testament, housed in the State and University Library of Hamburg (Diebner and Kasser, *Die alttestamentlichen Texte*). The manuscript is partially extant for Songs of Songs, Lamentations and Ecclesiastes. In the case of Ecclesiastes, the Coptic version seems largely to be based on a *Vorlage* similar to Vaticanus, while the Greek is independent from the Coptic's *Vorlage*. The find-spot of the codex is not known, but on paleographic grounds an approximate date has been assigned to it. The original publication of a portion of the codex placed it ca. 300 C.E., and this date is regularly cited (Rahlfs, *Verzeichnis*, pp. 134, 480). Neither of these early witnesses provides readings much earlier than the codices, and the Hamburg papyrus, which is the best preserved, is close to Vaticanus.

Gentry ('Issues') has outlined the issues in text criticism and demonstrated the variety of readings behind the witnesses to Ecclesiastes. A notable case is that discussed by Meade and Gentry ('Evaluating'), who argue convincingly that the reading *παραβολάς* in 1.17 is a corruption of *παραφοράς*, citing standard translation technique and the common phonological confusion of the labials ρ and φ, and of the liquids λ and ρ in intervocalic position. They note in particular that this corrupted reading *παραβολάς* is present in all Greek textual traditions of the Septuagint, with the exception of a supralinear reading of MS 788, and that it has influenced the Peshitta reading of  'proverbs, parables', which can be only accounted for as dependent upon an OG witness. This would date the Greek of Ecclesiastes and the versions containing the corruption at 1.17 to a time before the Peshitta, and one that entered all the witnesses early on. For further discussions of text-critical details and the later witnesses, see the publications by Gentry.

VI. Ideology and Exegesis

It is not easy to infer intentional exegetical purposes in the translation when its nature is to adhere so closely to its source text. The close following of the Hebrew could suggest that the translator held the Hebrew language as important or even sacred at the time of the formative rabbinic movement and the debates over canon (cf. *m. Yad.* 3:5). It could

alternatively suggest the purpose was to teach Hebrew when it was little known, the translation permitting close comparison with the Hebrew (Vermes, 'Review', p. 264). The suggestion that the translation method was for rabbinic hermeneutical purposes derives from the tradition of Aquila as the pupil of rabbi Aqiba, and from rabbinic discussions that Aqiba placed exegetical importance on the direct object marker $\pi\alpha$ (*Gen. R.* 1.14 on Gen. 1.1; cf. *Les devanciers*). This connection is now considered slight (Grabbe, 'Aquila's Translation') and most would see the translation method as a development of the *kaige* tradition rather than having an intentional hermeneutical purpose.

Theological exegesis is also slight and to place weight on any words when there is such a precise translation method is unwise. Interpretations tend to be based on how the words would be read by later readers (cf. Holm-Nielsen, 'Interpretation'; Bertram, 'Hebraischer'). Some words have a philosophical, principally Stoic, connotation such as *προαίρεσις* 'choice' (to follow a philosophical way) (1.17, etc.), *ἀντίρρησις* 'refutation' (8.11), *περισπασμός* 'distraction' (2.23, etc.), *εὐτονία* 'vigour' (7.7), as well as the general topics of the *ψυχή*, 'soul' and *πνεῦμα* 'spirit'. This vocabulary could reflect a recognition of the quasi-philosophical nature of the original Hebrew book, but cannot be seen as a systematic philosophical exposition. The proverbial nature of the book might have led to an association with philosophical maxims especially when traditions of popular sayings caught on in the Roman period (Morgan, *Popular*).

It is clear that concern for the Hebrew is the central ideological position of the translator, which can in part be explained in the context of formative rabbinic focus on the biblical text and attention to the meaning of the Hebrew, even if it is wrong to relate specific features to rabbinic hermeneutics. This concern is not only one for a sacred text but could also be for grammatical accuracy. The balance between adherence to the Hebrew and concern for Greek rhetorical style (§ IV) indicates an intellectual environment where these techniques would be appreciated, and probably one where knowledge of both Hebrew and Greek was expected. Appreciation of the representation of Hebrew forms and the rhetorical effects of the Greek places the translator and his audience in an intellectual (even early rabbinic) environment.

VII. Reception History

There is little obvious use of LXX Ecclesiastes before the third century C.E. The few possible allusions in the New Testament are not clear borrowings from the Greek version, and little can be made of the use of *ματαιότης* in Rom. 8.20 (cf. 2 Pet. 2.18). It is not a certain allusion to Ecclesiastes. The debate in early Judaism concerning the canonicity of the book (*m. Yad.* 3:5) and its very late adoption into the liturgy might account for this lack of citation. Indeed, even the Hebrew version is not of great significance (Flesher, 'Wisdom', p. 269). Wisdom as a theme is not prominent in rabbinic theology, and the midrashim on the sapiential books are all late. Indeed the pessimism of Ecclesiastes was contradictory to rabbinic theology (Flesher, 'Wisdom', pp. 273–75). Jerome (*Comm. Eccl.*, PL 23, p. 1172) even says that still in his time (fourth century) some Jewish scholars thought it should be suppressed because of its radical thoughts. The LXX also did not make clear the ascription to Solomon, merely calling the author as the word Ecclesiastes (1.1). This might reflect an early strand of rabbinic tradition reluctant to acknowledge the inspiration of Solomon in the composition of Ecclesiastes (Christianson, *Ecclesiastes*, p. 89).

Only from the mid-third century did Christians, using the Greek translation, begin to comment on Ecclesiastes. Origen (early third century) made some observations in his preface to the *Commentary on the Song of Songs*, leaving it to his pupils, Gregory Thaumaturgos and Dionysius the Great, to write more detailed studies (see Vinel, *Bd'A* 18, pp. 89–94; Bartholomew, *Ecclesiastes*, pp. 25–34). It has been suggested that one motivation for Gregory Thaumaturgos's rewriting was to provide a more readable and literary version than the original LXX version, with its awkward translation style (Jarick, *Gregory*, p. 5).

In Jewish tradition the LXX continued to play a part in influencing later Greek versions used by Jews in the Byzantine Empire. One Genizah leaf from a quire has survived of a version in vernacular Greek (written in Hebrew characters), which shows some affinities with the LXX even if it displays some creativity of its own (T-S Misc. 28.74; de Lange, *Greek*, pp. 71–78). It also uses *σύν* to mark the direct object, but prefers *γάργ* (cf. Psalms) to *καίγ*. In Rabbinic fashion it interprets the fool as the *χωρικός* 'rustic, of the countryside', an equivalent to the *עם הארץ* (so de Lange, *Greek*, p. 72).

Bibliography

- Aitken, J.K., 'Neologisms: A Septuagint Problem', in J.K. Aitken, J.S. Clines and C. Maier (eds.), *Interested Readers* (Festschrift David J.A. Clines; Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013), pp. 315–29.
- 'Rhetoric and Poetry in Greek Ecclesiastes', *BIOSCS* 38 (2005), pp. 55–78.
- Bartholomew, C.G., *Ecclesiastes* (Baker Commentary on the Old Testament Wisdom and Psalms; Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2009).
- Bertram, G., 'Hebraischer und griechischer Qohelet', *ZAW* 64 (1952), pp. 26–49.
- Burkitt, F.C. (ed.), *Fragments of the Books of Kings according to the Translation of Aquila* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1897).
- Christianson, E.S., *Ecclesiastes Through the Centuries* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2007).
- Clarysse, W., 'Linguistic Diversity in the Archive of the Engineers Kleon and Theodoros', in T.V. Evans and D. Obbink (eds.), *The Language of Papyri* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), pp. 35–50.
- Costas, P.S., *An Outline of the History of the Greek Language: With Particular Emphasis on the Koine and the Subsequent Periods* (Bibliotheca eurasiatrica Americana, historico-philologica 6; Chicago: Ares, 1979).
- de Lange, N.R.M., *Greek Jewish Texts from the Cairo Genizah* (TSAJ 51; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996).
- Diebner, J.B., and R. Kasser, *Die alttestamentlichen Texte des Papyrus bilinguis 1 der Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Hamburg: Canticum Canticorum (coptice), Lamentationes Ieremiae (coptice), Ecclesiastes (graece et coptice)* (Cahiers d'Orientalisme, 18; Genève: Cramer, 1989).
- Dillmann, A., 'Über die griechischer Qohelet', *Sitzungsberichte der königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin* 1 (1892), pp. 3–16.
- Flesher, P.V.M., 'The Wisdom of the Sages: Rabbinic Rewriting of Qohelet', in E.M. Meyers and P.V.M. Flesher (eds.), *Aramaic in Postbiblical Judaism and Early Christianity: Papers from the 2004 National Endowment for the Humanities Summer Seminar at Duke University* (Duke Judaic Studies Series 3; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2010), pp. 269–79.
- Gentry, P.J., 'Hexaplaric Materials in Ecclesiastes and the Rôle of the Syro-Hexapla', *Aramaic Studies* 1 (2003), pp. 5–28.
- 'Issues in the Text-History of LXX Ecclesiastes', in W. Kraus and M. Karrer (eds.), *Die Septuaginta—Texte, Theologien, Einflüsse. 2. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 23.–27.7.2008* (WUNT 1.252; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), pp. 201–22.
- 'Propaedeutic to a Lexicon of the Three: The Priority of a New Critical Edition of Hexaplaric Fragments', *Aramaic Studies* 2 (2004), pp. 145–74.
- 'The Relationship of Aquila and Theodotion to the Old Greek of Ecclesiastes in the Marginal Notes of the Syro-Hexapla', *Aramaic Studies* 2 (2004), pp. 63–84.

- ‘The Role of the “Three” in the Text History of the Septuagint, 2: Aspects of Interdependence of the Old Greek and the Three in Ecclesiastes’, *Aramaic Studies* 4 (2006), pp. 153–92.
- ‘Some Problems in the Septuagint Text History of Ecclesiastes’, in M.K.H. Peters (ed.), *XIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Ljubljana, 2007* (SBLSCS 55; Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008), pp. 133–53.
- Goldman, Y.A.P., ‘Introductions. Qoheleth’, in A. Schenker et al. (eds.), *Biblia Hebraica Quinta, Fascicle 18: General Introduction and Megilloth* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2004), pp. 13*–17*.
- Grabbe, L.L., ‘Aquila’s Translation and Rabbinic Exegesis’, *JJS* 33 (1982), pp. 527–36.
- Graetz, H., *Kohélet קהלת oder der Salomonische Prediger: übersetzt und kritisch erläutert. Nebst Anhang über Kohélet’s Stellung im Kanon, über die griechische Uebersetzung desselben und über Graecismen darin und einem Glossar* (Leipzig: C. F. Winter’sche, 1871).
- Gwynn, R.M., ‘Notes on the Vocabulary of Ecclesiastes in Greek’, *Hermathena* 42 (1920), pp. 115–22.
- Holm-Nielsen, S., ‘On the Interpretation of Qoheleth in Early Christianity’, *VT* 24 (1974), pp. 168–77.
- Hyvärinen, K., *Die Übersetzung von Aquila* (ConBOT; Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1977).
- Jarick, J., ‘Aquila’s Qoheleth’, *Textus* 15 (1990), pp. 131–39.
- Gregory Thaumaturgos’ Paraphrase of Ecclesiastes* (SBLSCS 29; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1990).
- Klostermann, E., *De libri Coheleth versione Alexandrina. Dissertatio Inauguralis quam consensus et auctoritate amplissimi philosophorum ordinis in universitate Christiana Albertina Kiliensi ad summos in philosophia honores rite capessendos* (Kiel: Ex officina Schmidt & Klaunig, 1892).
- McNeile, A.H., *Introduction to Ecclesiastes* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1904).
- Meade, J.D., and P.J. Gentry, ‘Evaluating Evaluations: The Commentary of *BHQ* and the Problem of הוֹלֵלוּת in Ecclesiastes in 1:17’, in G. Bonney and R. Vicent (eds.), *Sophia-Paideia. Sapienza e educazione (Sir 1,27)—Miscellanea di studi offerti in onore del prof. Don Mario Cimosà* (Nuova biblioteca scienze religiose 34; Rome: LAS Editrice, 2012), pp. 197–217.
- Morgan, T., *Popular Morality in the Early Roman Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007).
- Rahlfs, A., *Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des Alten Testaments. Vol. I.1, Die Überlieferung bis zum VIII. Jahrhundert, Bearbeitet von Detlef Fraenkel* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004).
- Roca Puig, R., ‘PMed. Inv. n. 151 (Eccl. III, 17-18, 21-22)’, *Aegyptus* 32 (1952), pp. 215–22.
- Salters, R.B., ‘Observations on the Septuagint of Ecclesiastes’, *OTE* 6 (1993), pp. 163–74.

- Taylor, C., 'Preface', in F.C. Burkitt (ed.), *Fragments of the Books of Kings according to the Translation of Aquila* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1897), pp. v–vii.
- Vermes, G., 'Review of *Les devanciers d'Aquila*', *JSS* 11 (1966), pp. 261–64.
- Yi, Y.Y., 'Translation Technique of the Greek Ecclesiastes' (Ph.D. dissertation, The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2005).
- Ziegler, J., 'Die Wiedergabe der *Nota Accusativi* $\rho\epsilon\tau$, $\rho\alpha\epsilon\tau$ - mit $\sigma\lambda\nu$ ', *ZAW* 100 (Sup.) (1988), pp. 222–33.

Canticles (Song of Songs)

Jean-Marie Auwers

Editions

(a) Standard Greek Editions

Göttingen (currently in preparation; ed. Schulz-Flügel).
Rahlfs-Hanhart, vol. II, pp. 260–70.
Swete, vol. II, pp. 506–18.

(b) Other Greek Editions

‘Text and Interpretation of Old Greek Song of Songs’ (Treat, 2004).¹
Vetus Testamentum Græcum (Holmes and Parsons, 1798).

(c) Modern Translations

NETS (Treat, 2007), pp. 657–66.
LXX.D (Herzer and Maier, 2009), pp. 998–1006.
La Biblia Griega, vol. III (Fernández Marcos *et al.*, 2013), pp. 381–410.

I. General Characteristics

The Greek translation of Canticles reflects a high degree of adherence to its Hebrew source-text, following closely the syntax and word order of the Hebrew, and displaying consistent lexical equivalents. This leads to a loss of much of the poetic quality and beauty of the original. The close adherence to the source text suggests the translation is part of the *kaige* tradition, and therefore probably to be dated as one of the latest of the Septuagint translations.

1. This dissertation provides a new critical edition in the format of the Variants module of the Computer Assisted Tools for Septuagint Study (CATSS).

Barthélemy (*Les devanciers*, p. 158) identified affinities that LXX Canticles shares with the Greek translations of Ruth and Lamentations, forming ‘a typical sub-group’ of the *kaige* recension. Harl (‘La version’) also noted significant contacts between the vocabulary of LXX Canticles and the *kaige* group, or more precisely, Theodotion. Among the characteristics identified pertaining to the *kaige* group, we may note *καίτε* as a rendering of קַיִט (8.1, although in 7.14 קַיִט is rendered by Greek *πρός*) and two uses of *ἀνήρ* for אִישׁ in the sense of ‘each’ (3.8; 8.11). Barthélemy’s thesis is subject to at least two criticisms: (a) in 5.7, לְמַעַן is translated by *ἀπό*, while the stereotyped translation of this word in the *kaige* group is *ἐπάνωθεν*; (b) biblical manuscripts and patristic sources attribute to Theodotion 12 or 13 readings that are in disagreement with LXX Canticles (Harl, ‘La version’, pp. 104–108). This second objection, however, can be accounted for. The attribution of these readings to Theodotion is not certain, and furthermore ‘if it is true that Theodotion revised the text of LXX Canticles (assuming he is not himself the author), then he used it as his base text, making only minor adjustments’ (Harl ‘La version’, p. 119). If he is the author, these differences can be accounted for by supposing a second edition of his own translation, revised by Theodotion himself. Gerleman (*Ruth—Das Hohelied*, p. 80) labelled the Greek translation of Canticles as ‘slavish’ (*slavisch*), while Siegert has categorised it as an example of ‘translations (of extreme subservience) to the source-language’ (*ausgangssprachliche Übersetzungen [Extrem der Unfreiheit]*) (*Eine Einführung*, p. 42).

II. Time and Place of Composition

The attribution of LXX Canticles to Theodotion remains disputed. Nonetheless, there is a consensus that this version was written late, probably in the first century C.E. or at the earliest during the first century B.C.E., perhaps in Palestine, with the aim of following closely a Hebrew model (Treat, ‘Lost Keys’, p. 384). Had there existed an earlier version that was supplanted by the LXX version, no clearly identifiable trace has come down to us.

III. Language

The style of Greek is extremely cumbersome. The Hebrew words are rendered one for one in stereotyped fashion. For example (Cant. 8.11):

ἀμπελῶν ἐγενήθη τῷ Σαλωμων ἐν Βεελαμων·
ἔδωκεν τὸν ἀμπελῶνα αὐτοῦ τοῖς τηροῦσιν,
ἀνὴρ οἴσει ἐν καρπῷ αὐτοῦ χιλίους ἀργυρίου.

A vineyard was to Salomon at Beelamon;
he gave his vineyard to the keepers;
a man will bring for its fruit a thousand (pieces) of silver.

The Greek γίνομαι + dative renders mechanically the Hebrew היה construction with the preposition ל; ἀνὴρ is a stereotyped rendering of שׂוֹא, which here has the sense of ‘each’; ἐν (καρπῷ αὐτοῦ) renders inappropriately the preposition כ, used in the sense of ‘in return for’ (GELS, p. 231); χιλίους ἀργυρίου is a calque of כסף קלף.

The syntax of the Hebrew is slavishly reproduced, resulting in a surprising, if not misleading, text. For example, Cant. 3.4a is translated word for word, contrary to the norms of Greek usage:

ὡς μικρὸν ὅτε παρήλθον ἀπ’ αὐτῶν, ἕως οὗ εὔρον ὃν ἠγάπησεν ἡ ψυχὴ μου.

Scarcely had I passed from them until I found him whom my soul loved.

Another example of odd syntax is the rendering of the same entreaty formula that is found twice in Canticles (2.7; 3.5):

...השבעתִי אתכם בנות ירושלם...
אִם־תִּעִירוּ וְאִם־תִּעוּרוּרָו אֶת־הָאֱהָבָה עַד שֶׁתִּחַפֵּץ

I adjure you, O daughters of Jerusalem...
do not stir up or awaken love until it is ready! (NRSV)

After a formula of swearing, the particle אִם has the sense of ‘certainly not’ (Joüon-Muraoka, § 165d). אִם־תִּעִירוּ...השבעתִי therefore signifies ‘I adjure you: be careful not to awaken!’ The Greek translator has rendered mechanically אִם by ἐάν, creating a prospective conditional with a force not known in Greek (Thackeray, p. 54):

ὤρκισα ὑμᾶς, θυγατέρες Ιερουσαλημ...
ἐὰν ἐγείρητε καὶ ἐξεγείρητε τὴν ἀγάπην, ἕως οὗ θελήσῃ.

I have adjured you, O daughters of Ierousalem ...
that you do not stir up or awaken love until it wish! (NETS)

Moreover, most ancient commentators (Origen, Gregory of Nyssa, Nilus of Ancyra, Theodoret) took it that the daughters of Jerusalem had been invited to awaken dormant love, that is to say they understood the text to mean the opposite of the Hebrew, and probably also the opposite of what the translator had intended (Barbàra, ‘Interpretazioni patristiche’).

In certain places the syntax (or lack of proper syntax) gives the impression that the translator has translated the words one by one, regardless of their logical connection. Thus in Cant. 3.8:

ἀνὴρ ῥομφαία αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ μῆρον αὐτοῦ
ἀπὸ θάμβους ἐν νυξίν.

(every) man (having) his sword at his thigh
because of terror by night.

The Hebrew text of Canticles contains a number of obscure passages that the translator has reproduced word for word, resulting in a Greek text as enigmatic as its Hebrew model, such that we do not know how the translator understood these passages—or indeed whether he did understand them. Thus, in the well-known *crux interpretum* of Cant. 6.12, the translator has reproduced word for word the Hebrew text before him:

MT: לֹא יָדַעְתִּי נַפְשִׁי שֶׁמִּתְּנִי מִרְכַּבֹּת עַמִּי־נָדִיב

NRSV: Before I was aware, my fancy set me in a chariot beside my prince.

LXX: Οὐκ ἔγνω ἡ ψυχὴ μου· ἔθετό με ἄρματα Αμιναδαβ.

NETS: My soul was not aware; it made me as Aminadab’s chariots.

Again at 5.6:

MT: נַפְשִׁי יָצָאָה בְּדַבְּרוֹ

NRSV: My soul failed me when he spoke.

LXX: ψυχὴ μου ἐξῆλθεν ἐν λόγῳ αὐτοῦ.

NETS: My soul went out when he spoke.

In several places the translation is barely intelligible. In 4.1, one reads:

ὀφθαλμοί σου περιστεραι ἐκτὸς τῆς σιωπήσεώς σου.

The words ἐκτὸς τῆς σιωπήσεώς σου reappear in Cant. 4.3 and 6.7 where they are the equivalents, as here, of the Hebrew מבעד לצמתך ‘behind your veil’. The sense of MT is clear: the eyes of the beloved are hidden behind the veil which, being translucent, is suggestive of the beauty of the face. The translation of הצמ by σιώπησις is surprising, because the Greek word probably does not denote ‘covering, veil’ (LSJ; LEH), but rather ‘silence, taciturnity’ (Ceulemans and De Crom, ‘Greek Renderings’). This translation seems to be based on relating the noun הצמ to the root חמץ (‘to destroy’ or ‘to silence’, cf. Blakeney, ‘Note’). Therefore the translation of the colon is most likely: ‘Your eyes are doves—apart from your taciturnity’ (NETS). This is an example of an atomistic translation, where the translator has apparently interpreted a rare word regardless of context.

In 7.6, the translator appears to have interpreted the *hapax legomenon* *טרה (‘tress, flowing lock’?) on the basis of a root known from Aramaic with the meaning ‘to run’, translating it by παραδρομή ‘running beside’ (LEH: ‘corridor, gallery’); consequently the strange phrase has been variously interpreted by ancient commentators (Auwers, *L’interprétation*, pp. 111–12):

βασιλεὺς δεδεμένος ἐν παραδρομαῖς (‘a king is bound by retinues’, NETS; in place of the MT: ‘a king is held captive in the tresses’, NRSV)

In 4.13, the translator has interpreted the word הלש, whose meaning is disputed, as the verb הלש ‘to send’ and translated it by ἀποστολή ‘emission’ (LEH: ‘shoot’). The result is a rather explicit translation:

ἀποστολαί σου παράδεισος ροῶν μετὰ καρποῦ ἀκροδρῶν (‘your scents are an orchard of pomegranates with fruit of fruit-trees’, NETS; in place of MT: ‘Your channel is an orchard of pomegranates with all choicest fruits’, NRSV).

IV. Translation

The translator almost never tries to vary his vocabulary: a Hebrew word is normally translated by the same Greek word in all its occurrences. Thus, אהב is always translated by ἀγαπάω ‘to love’ (Cant. 1.3, 4, 7; 3.1,

2, 3, 4), **בשם** by *ἄρωμα* ‘spice’ (Cant. 4.10, 16; 5.1, 13; 6.2; 8.14), **יפה** by *καλός* ‘fair’ (Cant. 1.8, 15ab, 16; 2.10, 13; 4.1 *bis*, 7; 5.9; 6.1, 4, 10), **ריח** by *ὄσμη* ‘smell’ (Cant. 1.3, 12; 2.13; 4.10, 11 *bis*; 7.9, 14), and so on.

It can be seen from these examples that when the translator was faced with a well-attested Hebrew word, he adopted the most commonly used Greek equivalent in the LXX (for example *ἀγαπάω* rather than *φιλέω* to translate **אהב**, *ποιμαίνω* instead of *βόσκω* as a translation of **רעה**, etc.). The reason why the Greek translation of Canticles contains a number of words not attested elsewhere in the LXX is because the Hebrew text itself contains many *hapax legomena* or rare words; for example, **פגיה** translated by *ἄλυθος* ‘early fig’ (2.13a), **רפידה** translated by *ἀνάκλιτον* ‘seat’ or ‘back’ (3.10), **לבב** (Piel) translated by *καρδιόω* ‘to hearten’ or ‘make love’ (4.9ab), and **דגל** rendered by *ἐκλογίζω* (5.10b) (Ausloos and Lemmelijn, ‘Rendering Love’). More surprising is the translation of **דוד** by the singular *ἀδελφιδός* ‘nephew’ or ‘little brother’ (34 occurrences: Cant. 1.13, 14, 16, etc.; in Cant. 8.1, the word translates **אח** ‘brother’). The Greek translator already had at his disposal many translation equivalents in the LXX books previously translated, including *πατράδελφος* to translate **דוד** in the sense of ‘paternal uncle’ in the historical books, and *ἀγαπητός* which was chosen for **דוד** in the sense of ‘lover’ in Isa. 5.1. The translator of Canticles displays originality in choosing *ἀδελφιδός*, a word not attested in Greek earlier or appearing elsewhere in the LXX (Auwers, ‘Les désignations’).

The Greek translator did not seek to introduce changes in the doublets in the Hebrew (Cant. 1.15 = 4.1ab; 2.6 = 8.3; 2.7 = 3.5; 2.17a = 4.6a; 3.1c = 5.6d). One should note, however, two exceptions: in 3.3a **השמרים** is translated by *οἱ τηροῦντες*, while in the doublet in 5.7a it is translated by *οἱ φύλακες*, although there is no explanation for this variation. In Cant. 2.9 and 8.14, **צבי** is translated by *δορκάς*, while in 2.17 it is rendered by *δόρκων*.

The preposition/prefix **מן** (occurring 34 times in Canticles) is almost always rendered by *ἀπό*, regardless of use: partitive **מן** (Cant. 1.2a; 3.7c; 4.9b; 5.10b), and **מן** of separation (3.6a; 4.8abcd; 4.15b, etc.), of cause (3.8d), of origin (3.10e) or of comparison (4.10b; 5.9ab). The following are exceptions: in 2.9, which speaks of the beloved who observes ‘through’ the windows and spying ‘through’ the mesh, **מן** has been sensibly rendered by *διά*. In 4.9bc, **מן** is translated successively by *ἀπό* +

genitive (for partitive מן) and by the genitive alone (for מן expressing provenance): *ἐκαρδίωσας ἡμᾶς ἐνὶ ἀπὸ ὀφθαλμῶν σου* (= מניעמ), *ἐν μιᾷ ἐνθέματι τραχήλων σου* (= מצורניע), ‘You heartened us with one from your eyes, in one, with an emplacement of your necks’ (NETS). Finally, the מן of comparison is rendered by *ὑπέρ* in 1.2b, 4e; 4.10c. In Cant. 4.10bc, the מן of comparison is therefore translated once by *ἀπό*, and then by *ὑπέρ*:

Τί ἐκαλλιώθησαν μαστοί σου ἀπὸ οἴνου (מיי);
Καὶ ὄσμη ἱματίων σου ὑπὲρ πάντα τὰ ἀρώματα (מכלבשמים).

How beautiful your breasts have become, above wine,
and your garment’s fragrance, beyond all spices! (NETS).

It is possible that the translator thought in the first case that the prefix was not the מן of comparison but מן of cause: ‘How beautiful your breasts have become under the influence of wine!’ However, in the parallel 1.2b, the translator has rendered the מן by *ὑπέρ* (ὅτι ἀγαθοὶ μαστοί σου ὑπὲρ οἶνον [MT: מיי]).

The translator has been more inventive when translating the *dativus commodi*: in 1.8b, מצי-ל is translated by *ἔξελεθ* σύ; in 2.13d (= 2.14a LXX), מלי-ל is similarly rendered by *ἐλθε* σύ (cf. also 2.17b), but in 2.11b לו לל is translated by *ἐπορεύθη* ἑαυτῷ, in 4.6b לי אל is translated by *πορεύσομαι* ἑμαυτῷ, and, in 1.8a, מל-תדעי אל is translated by *ἐὰν μὴ γνῶς σεαυτὴν* (‘if you don’t know yourself’), that is to say, in this second case, מל has been interpreted as a direct object (cf. Ps. 69.6).

The choice of vocabulary in the translation is sometimes surprising. Thus, in Cant. 2.5b, מצי-תפוחים רפדוני *‘refresh me with apples’* (NRSV) is translated by *στοιβάσατέ με ἐν μήλοις*, literally: ‘heap me onto apples’, which did not fail to confuse the ancient readers (see, e.g., Gregory, *Homilies* 4 [ed. H. Langerbeck, pp. 123–27]).

In some cases, the translator gave up translating and simply transcribed the Hebrew word: *θαπιωθ* for מלפיות (4.4), *αλωθ* for מלהות (4.14), *φάζ* for מצי (transliterated in 5.11 but translated by *χρυσός* in 5.15). In this last case the inconsistency can be explained by the fact that in Cant. 5.11 מצי is preceded by the word מותם, which the translator has rendered by *χρυσίον*.

The cases where the Greek translator has sought to clarify the meaning of the text are the exception (see § V).

V. Key Text-Critical Issues

LXX Canticles attests to the same recension as the MT. However, the Greek version contains some words not found in Hebrew. In some cases, these additional words have simple explanations and do not necessarily require a *Vorlage* different from the Hebrew MT (5.2 + ἐπὶ τὴν θύραν; 5.12c + ὑδάτων; 7.1 + ἡ ἐρχομένη). In most cases, these are doublets, that is to say elements included in the parallel passages of the Song and which were repeated for harmonisation. Thus, ὑπὲρ πάντα τὰ ἀρώματα (1.3) appears in a similar context in 4.10; ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη Βαιθηλ (2.9) can be found, with a variant, in 2.17; περιστέρα μου (2.13) reinforces the parallel with 2.10 LXX. The stich peculiar to the LXX in 3.1 is a doublet of 5.6; the two stichs peculiar to the LXX in 6.7 are a doublet of 4.3. The words ἐκεῖ δώσω τοὺς μαστοὺς μου σοί (6.11) reappear in 7.13. The expression ἐν ταῖς δυνάμεσιν καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἰσχύσεσιν τοῦ ἀγροῦ (5.8; 8.4) appears in the parallels in 2.7 and 3.5; the addition καὶ εἰς ταμιεῖον τῆς συλλαβούσης με in 8.2 enforces the parallel with 3.4. Since the Greek translator shows himself to be very careful to respect his source text, it is reasonable to think that these words were already in the Hebrew text he translated.

The opposite phenomenon (pluses in the MT) is rare: the ancient LXX has nothing corresponding to בנות ציון ‘daughters of Zion’ in 3.11, or to תלמדני ‘she/you teach(es) me’ in 8.2. In 5.6, where the Hebrew has עבר עבר (‘he had turned, had left’), the LXX simply has παρῆλθεν ‘he had passed by’. But it is possible that the translator chose to render by a compound verb a pair of Hebrew verbs joined by asyndeton, as if they were a single expression.

In some passages, the translator apparently has before him a Hebrew model slightly different from the received consonantal Hebrew text, or otherwise vocalised his *Vorlage* differently from the Masoretes. Some examples: in 1.4, where the MT reads ‘Draw me after you, let us make haste’ (it is his beloved speaking and addressing the young man), the LXX has εἴλκυσάν σε, ὀπίσω σου εἰς ὄσμην μύρων σου δραμοῦμεν (‘they [= the maidens, cf. v. 3] drew you; after you, into the fragrance of your anointing oils we shall run’); the Greek suggests that the young man has previously yielded to the charms of women other than the beloved. In Cant. 1.2, 4; 4.10 *bis*; 7.13, where the MT has the plural form of the word דוד (‘love, pleasure of love’) with a pronominal suffix, the translator has

the word *μαστοί*, which means he has read a form of the word *דָּד* ('breast') and not the word *דִּד*. Did the translator there wish to underline the erotic nature of Canticles (as Gerleman, *Ruth—Das Hohelied*, p. 78; Keel, *Hohelied*, p. 14)? It is unlikely. First, if the Hebrew *דִּד* has the sense of 'a physical sexual relationship' (cf. *TDOT*, vol. III, p. 151), it is unclear how the translation *μαστοί* accentuates the erotic dimension of the text. Second, the translation *μαστοί* probably reflects how the word was read in the translator's milieu, not a personal choice by him (Kingsmill, 'Love'). Furthermore, the focus on the breast of the male protagonist (Cant. 1.2, 4) is perhaps to be seen as an allegory *ab absurdo*, given that images of God as a suckling nurse are not uncommon in biblical and parabiblical literature (Auwers, 'Le traducteur grec').

In 4.8, the MT, as vocalised ('Come with me from Lebanon'), assumes that the two lovers find themselves outside of Palestine, while, according to the LXX (*δεῦρο ἀπὸ Λιβάνου*, 'come here from Lebanon'), the man is in Palestine, from where he calls his beloved to join him. Canticles 8.13 is addressed to the young women according to MT (*תְּשִׁינֵי* is feminine), while in the LXX the verse is addressed to his companion who sits in gardens (*ὁ καθήμενος ἐν κήποις*).

In manuscripts of the LXX, the text of Canticles is sometimes divided differently from the MT (Treat, 'Lost Keys', pp. 389–93). Some of these different divisions affect the meaning. Thus, manuscripts of the LXX join Cant. 1.12a to Cant. 1.11: 'We will make you images of gold...until the king is on his couch'; Cant. 2.17a to Cant. 2.16: 'My little brother is mine and I am his, who pastures among the lilies until the day breathes and the shadows stir'; Cant. 4.6a to Cant. 4.5: 'Your two breasts are like two fawns, twins of a gazelle, that feed among the lilies until the day breathes and the shadows stir'.

One of the difficulties encountered by readers of the Song is determining who is speaking to whom at any given time. The problem arises from the prologue on, whether reading in Hebrew or Greek (Auwers, 'Le prologue'). Some manuscripts (Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus, Venetus, Rahlfs 161) include rubrics that identify the speaker: *ἡ νύμφη*, *ὁ νυμφίος*, *νεανίδες*, *φίλοι*, etc. The most developed system is that of Sinaiticus; it recurs in the Latin tradition, notably codex Amiatinus (Treat, 'Lost Keys', pp. 399–514). The rubrics of Alexandrinus and

Sinaiticus can be found in Rahlfs-Hanhart's edition, at the end of the text of Canticles. The rubrics of Venetus and Rahlfs's codex 161 have been edited by Klostermann ('Rollenverteilung'; *Analecta*, pp. 41–42), and they all have been compiled by Treat ('Lost Keys', pp. 399–411).

VI. Ideology and Exegesis

At the time when Canticles was translated into Greek it was subjected to an allegorical reading in Pharisaic circles, whereby the beloved was identified with God and his partner with Israel. There was a rabbinic ban on the profane use of Canticles, for example at banquets or popular festivals (on the canonicity, see Barthélemy, 'Comment'; Saebø, 'On the Canonicity'; Barton, 'The Canonicity'). Did the translator try to orientate the reading of the Song as an allegory? The answer is no (Fernández Marcos, 'La lectura'). In Canticles the male protagonist is designated most often by the word *τίτ* ('uncle' or 'lover'), which the Greek translator rendered by a term expressing a relationship (*ἀδελφιδός*, 'nephew' or 'little brother'), when he could have translated by *ἀγαπητός* ('beloved'), as in Isa. 5.1, where the word refers to God. It is not clear in what sense God may be the nephew or younger brother of Israel. The Greek translator did not choose translation equivalents so as to suggest, in the relationship of two lovers, a picture of God's love for his people (Auwers, 'Les Septante', pp. 44–47).

Translation choices that might suggest the translator intended to impose a religious reading on the text are few and difficult to interpret (Auwers, 'Le traducteur grec'; Ausloos and Lemmelijn, 'Canticles as Allegory?').

The Greek translator has provided etymological renderings for three Hebrew toponyms: *ἀρχὴ πίστεως* for Amanah (Cant. 4.8), *εὐδοκία* for Tirzah (Cant. 6.4) and *θυγάτηρ πολλῶν* for Bath-Rabbîm (Cant. 7.5). Should we see here a desire to allegorise the text? It might just be that the translator is offering a conjecture on single words, which he has not recognised as actual place names (Harl, 'La version', pp. 108–12).

In 2.7 and 3.5 (cf. also 5.8 LXX and 8.4 LXX), the plea 'by the gazelles or by the hinds of the field' (MT) has become in the LXX a plea 'by the powers and by the forces of the field' (*ἐν ταῖς δυνάμεσιν καὶ ἐν ταῖς*

ἰσχύσεσιν τοῦ ἀγροῦ). Joüon claimed that the translator wanted to evoke the angelic hosts and their leaders (*Le Cantique*, pp. 67, 161), but this is not proven.

In Cant. 1.4, the translator has rendered מִיִּשְׂרָיִם אֱהָבֹךְ (‘rightly do they love you’) by εὐθύτης ἡγάπησέν σε (‘Uprightness has fallen in love with you’; Barbiero, *Cantico dei cantici*, p. 23). In fact, the Greek translator saw that the noun מִיִּשְׂרָיִם was a plural of abstraction, but without realising that here it functions as an adverb, with the result that he has made it the subject of the verb. In other words, the translator has rendered the Hebrew as he understood it.

The translator has taken a ‘neutral’ stance towards the text, probably because the allegorical import of Canticles was obvious to him and the religious dimension of the text did not need to be brought out (cf. Auwers, ‘Anciens et Modernes’).

VII. Reception History

There are no quotations nor any clear allusions from Canticles in the New Testament (some have suggested connecting Jn 7.38 and Cant. 4.15, Eph. 5.27 and Cant. 4.7, Rev. 3.20 and Cant. 5.2, but these comparisons are hardly convincing). By contrast, throughout Christian antiquity and the Middle Ages, Canticles, along with the Psalter, was the most widely read book from the Old Testament. Not only was it the subject of a good number of technical commentaries, but it was present in the liturgy, catechesis, theology and especially spirituality (Welsersheimb, ‘Kirchenbild’; Ohly, *Hohelied Studien*; Elliott, *Christology*; Auwers, ‘Lectures patristiques’).

Christian commentators replaced the Jewish interpretation that sees in the Song the celebration of the covenant between God and his people. For them, the figure of the beloved is sometimes identified with the Church, sometimes with the believer. The first strand of interpretation appears from the third century in the works of Hippolytus of Rome (d. 235 C.E.) and in the *Homilies* of Origen (d. 254 C.E.). In his *Commentary*, Origen sought to reconcile the two lines of interpretation. In Gregory of Nyssa (ca. 390) and Nilus of Ancyra (ca. 400), the interpretation is more mystical than ecclesial; in Philo of Carpasia (ca. 400)

and Theodoret of Cyrus (ca. 432), it is the opposite. The only known supporter of a non-allegorical interpretation is Theodore of Mopsuestia (d. 428 C.E.). For him, Canticles is a work that Solomon had prepared on the occasion of his celebration of his marriage to Pharaoh's daughter (Auwers, 'Lectures patristiques', pp. 131–36).

The commentaries of Nilus, Philo and Theodoret interpret the entire book. Hippolytus's commentary is restricted to just Cant. 3.8 (in the Georgian version). The two *Homilies* of Origen (preserved in the Latin translation of Jerome) cover Cant. 1.1–2.14; the first four books of his Commentary have survived (up to Cant. 2.14, in the Latin translation of Rufinus). The *Homilies* of Gregory of Nyssa break off at Cant. 6.9. They were supplemented (for Cant. 6.10–8.14) by a certain Symmachus, whose commentary has survived in Syriac. The Epitome of Canticles by Procopius of Gaza sheds light on exegesis of the Song not recorded elsewhere (in particular by Origen, Cyril of Alexandria and Apollinaris of Laodicea).

Bibliography

- Ausloos, H., and B. Lemmelijn, 'Canticles as Allegory? Textual Criticism and Literary Criticism in Dialogue', in H. Ausloos, B. Lemmelijn and M. Vervenne (eds.), *Florilegium Lovaniense* (Festschrift F. García Martínez; BETL 224; Leuven: Peeters, 2008), pp. 35–48.
- 'Rendering Love: Hapax Legomena and the Characterisation of the Translation Technique of Song of Songs', in H. Ausloos et al. (eds.), *Translating a Translation: The Septuagint and Its Modern Translations in the Context of Early Judaism* (BETL 213; Leuven: Peeters, 2008), pp. 43–61.
- Auwers, J.-M., 'Anciens et Modernes face au Cantique des cantiques. Un impossible dialogue?', in A. Lemaire (ed.), *Congress Volume, Leiden 2004* (VTSup 109; Leiden: Brill, 2006), pp. 235–53.
- 'Les chaînes exégétiques comme modèle de lecture polysémique. L'exemple de l'Épitomé sur le Cantique des cantiques', *RTL* 40 (2009), pp. 213–35.
- 'Les désignations des bien-aimés dans le Cantique des cantiques et leur traduction dans les langues modernes', in M. Karrer and W. Kraus (eds.), *Die Septuaginta. Texte, Theologien und Einflüsse* (WUNT 252; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), pp. 689–701.
- 'Lectures patristiques du Cantique des cantiques', in J. Nieuviarts and P. Debergé (eds.), *Les nouvelles voies de l'exégèse. En lisant le Cantique des cantiques. XIX^e Congrès de l'Association catholique pour l'étude de la Bible (Toulouse, septembre 2001)* (Lectio divina 190; Paris: Cerf, 2002), pp. 129–57.

- L'interprétation du Cantique des Cantiques à travers les chaînes exégétiques grecques* (Instrumenta Patristica et Medievalia 56 ; Turnhout: Brepols, 2011).
- ‘Le prologue du Cantique, monologue ou dialogue?’, in H. Ausloos, B. Lemmelijn and M. Vervenne (eds.), *Florilegium Lovaniense* (Festschrift F. García Martínez; BETL 224; Leuven: Peeters, 2008), pp. 49–56.
- ‘Les Septante, lecteurs du *Cantique des cantiques*’, *Graphè* 8 (1999), pp. 33–47.
- ‘Le traducteur grec a-t-il allégorisé ou érotisé le Cantique des cantiques?’, in M.K.H. Peters (ed.), *XII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies (Leiden, 2004)* (SBLSCS 54; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), pp. 161–68.
- Barbàra, M.-A., ‘Interpretazioni patristiche del *Cantico dei cantici* 2,7’, *Vetera Christianorum* 43 (2006), pp. 53–65.
- Barbiero, G., *Cantico dei cantici* (I libri biblici. Primo Testamento 24; Milano: Paoline, 2004).
- Barthélemy, D., ‘Comment le Cantique des Cantiques est-il devenu canonique?’, in A. Caquot, S. Légasse and M. Tardieu (eds.), *Mélanges bibliques et orientaux en l'honneur de M. Mathias Delcor* (AOAT 215; Neukirchen–Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1985), pp. 13–22 [reprinted in *Découvrir l'Écriture* (Lectio divina, hors série; Paris: Cerf, 2000), pp. 239–51].
- Barton, J., ‘The Canonicity of the Song of Songs’, in A.C. Hagedorn (ed.), *Perspectives on the Song of Songs. Perspektiven der Hoheliedauslegung* (BZAW 346; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2005), pp. 1–7.
- Blakeney, E.H., ‘A Note on the Word *σιώπησις*: Canticles 4,1. 3; 6,6’, *ExpT* 55 (1943–44), p. 138.
- Ceulemans, R., and D. De Crom, ‘Greek Renderings of the Hebrew Lexeme *צמה* in LXX Canticles and Isaiah’, *VT* 57 (2007), pp. 511–23.
- Elliott, M.W., *The Song of Songs and Christology in the Early Church 381–451* (STAC 7; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000).
- Fernández Marcos, N., ‘La lectura helenística del Cantar de los Cantares’, *Sefarad* 56 (1996), pp. 265–82.
- Garitte, G. (ed.), *Traité d'Hippolyte sur David et Goliath, sur le Cantique des cantiques et sur l'Antéchrist* (CSCO 263–264; scriptores iberici 15–16; Leuven: Secrétariat du CorpusSCO, 1965).
- Gerleman, G., *Ruth—Das Hohelied* (BKAT 18; Neukirchen–Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1965), pp. 77–82.
- Gregory of Nyssa, *In Canticum Canticorum* (ed. H. Langerbeck; Gregorii Nysseni Opera 6; Leiden: Brill, 1960).
- Harl, M., ‘La version LXX du Cantique des cantiques et le groupe Kaige-Théodotion’, *Textus* 18 (1995), pp. 101–20.
- Holmes, R., and J. Parsons, *Vetus Testamentum Græcum Cum Variis Lectionibus* (Oxonii: Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1798).

- Joüon, P., *Le Cantique des cantiques. Commentaire philologique et exégétique* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1909).
- Keel, O., *Das Hohelied* (Zürcher Bibelkommentar, Altes Testament 18; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1986).
- Kingsmill, E., “‘Love’ or ‘Breasts’ at Song of Songs 1:2 and 4? The Pre-Masoretic Evidence”, *Studia Patristica* 30 (1997), pp. 8–11.
- Klostermann, E., *Analecta zur Septuaginta, Hexapla und Patristik* (Leipzig: Deichert, 1895).
- ‘Eine alte Rollenverteilung zum Hohenliede’, *ZAW* 19 (1899), pp. 158–62.
- Lemmelijn, B., ‘Flora in Cantico Canticorum: Towards a More Precise Characterisation of Translation Technique in the LXX of Song of Songs’, in A. Voitila and J. Jokiranta (eds.), *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible and Dead Sea Scrolls* (Festschrift R. Sollamo; SJSJ 126; Leiden: Brill, 2008), pp. 27–51.
- Nilus of Ancyra, *Schriften*. Band 1. *Kommentar zum Hohelied* (ed. H.-U. Rosenbaum; Patristische Texte und Studien 57; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2004).
- Ohly, F., *Hohelied Studien. Grundzüge einer Geschichte der Hoheliedauslegung des Abendlandes bis um 1200* (Schriften der wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft an der Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main, Geisteswissenschaftliche Reihe 1; Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1958).
- Origen, *Commentario al Cantico dei cantici. Testi in lingua greca* (ed. and trans. M.A. Barbàra; Biblioteca patristica 42; Bologna: Dehoniane, 2005).
- Homilien zu Samuel I, zum Hohelied und zu den Propheten, Kommentar zum Hohelied, in Rufins und Hieronymus’ Übersetzungen* (ed. W.A. Baehrens; Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte 33; Origenes Werke 8; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1925).
- Philo of Carpasia, *Enarratio in Canticum Canticorum* (ed. M.A. Giacomelli) = PG 40, col. 28–153.
- Procopius of Gaza, *Epitome in Canticum canticorum* (ed. J.-M. Auwers; CCSG 56; Turnhout: Brepols, 2011).
- Saebø, M., ‘On the Canonicity of the Song of Songs’, in M.V. Fox *et al.* (eds.), *Texts, Temples and Traditions* (Festschrift M. Haran; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1996), pp. 267–77.
- Sanmartin-Ascaso, J., ‘דֹּחַ. dōdh’, in *TDOT*, vol. III, pp. 143–56.
- Symmachus, *Commentaire sur le Cantique des cantiques*, in C. van den Eynde, *La version syriaque du Commentaire de Grégoire de Nysse sur le Cantique des Cantiques. Ses origines, ses témoins, son influence* (Bibliothèque du Muséon 10; Leuven: Bureaux du Muséon, 1939), pp. 77–89.
- Theodoret of Cyrus, *Explanatio in Canticum canticorum* (ed. J.L. Schulze; Halle, 1769) = PG 81, col. 28–213.

The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint

- Treat, J.C., 'Aquila, Field, and the Song of Songs', in A. Salvesen (ed.), *Origen's Hexapla and Fragments: Papers Presented at the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla, Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, 25th July–3rd August 1994* (TSAJ 58; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), pp. 135–76.
- 'Lost Keys: Text and Interpretation of Old Greek Song of Songs and Its Earliest Manuscript Witness' (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1996).
- Welsersheimb, L., 'Das Kirchenbild der griechischen Väterkommentare zum Hohen Lied', *ZKT* 70 (1948), pp. 394–449.

Job

Claude E. Cox

Editions

(a) Standard Greek Editions

Göttingen, vol. XI.4, *Job* (Ziegler, 1982).¹

Rahlfs-Hanhart, vol. II, pp. 270–344.

Swete, vol. II, pp. 519–603.

(c) Modern Translations

NETS (Cox, 2007), pp. 667–96.

LXX.D (Kepper and Witte, 2009), pp. 1007–56.

La Biblia Griega, vol. III (Fernández Marcos *et al.*, 2013), pp. 411–98.

I. General Characteristics

Few books of the LXX corpus are more intriguing than the translation of Job. A glance at its NETS translation reveals that the Greek translation is hundreds of lines shorter than the MT and that, further, LXX Job is a paraphrastic, ‘free’ translation when the two are compared. It betrays less interference from its Hebrew parent text than most, if not all, translated books of the LXX; that is to say, the Koine of Job is most at home in its Greek environment. The translator, in a brilliant way, gives us an edited version of the story of Job; the text is reworked to such an extent that we might say he adopts the stance of an epitomiser, commentator, interpreter.

1. The fourth-century manuscript Vaticanus serves as the basis for the Old Greek translation of Job in Swete and Rahlfs-Hanhart; it is also the basis of Ziegler’s critical edition.

From the opening two sentences (v. 1) the reader sees that the Greek translator is going to adopt a free approach to the task. Compare the NRSV and NETS:

There was once a man in the land of Uz whose name was Job. That man was blameless and upright, one who feared God and turned away from evil. (NRSV)

There was a certain man in the land of Ausitis, whose name was Iob, and that man was genuine, blameless, righteous, religious, staying away from every evil thing. (NETS)

‘A man’ becomes ‘a certain man’; more noticeably, the four attributes of Job have become, in Greek, five: it appears that the Hebrew word rendered ‘upright’ has become both ‘genuine’ and ‘righteous’; further, ‘one who feared God’, is represented by one word, ‘religious’ or ‘pious’; finally the word ‘every’ is added, emphasising Job’s diligence.

In the prologue (chs. 1–2) the OG has a substantial addition, 2.9a-d, wherein Job’s wife gives voice to her anger at Job and expresses her personal distress concerning what has happened to her. She challenges him, when the parent text is rejoined, ‘Now say some word to the Lord and die!’ (2.9e). At the end of the book too the OG has two additions, the first brief, 42.17 α , ‘And it is written that he will rise again with those the Lord raises up’—a reference to resurrection of the dead. The second, 42.17 β α -e δ , is more substantial, forming an appendix so to speak, that begins with ‘This man is interpreted from the Syriac book’ (i.e., an Aramaic text), and goes on to connect Job with the Iobab of the patriarchal narratives (Gen. 36.33, 34). Job is thus provided with a genealogy that sets him both in ancient times and in Israel’s story. These expansions belong to early stages of the transmission of the OG text.

Although these additions are striking, LXX Job is much better known as a text shorter than the MT. Indeed, the OG translation is about one-sixth shorter. Individual lines are passed over, verses—sometimes two or three at a time—as well as larger passages (e.g., 21.28-33; 26.5-11; 34.28-33; 36.29–37.7a). Gray observed that the greater brevity increases the further one goes into the book: there is little abbreviation until chs. 12–14, where the OG is approximately 4% shorter; in chs. 15–21, 16%; in 22–31, 25%; in 32–37, the Elihu speeches, 35%; in 38–42, 16% (Driver and Gray, *Commentary*, p. lxxv). No single reason can be cited

to explain why the text, and thus the arguments, has been shortened in this fashion. However, that the translator felt free to do so likely stems, first, from the lack of authority the book held in the Jewish community over against, say, the Law and the Prophets and, second, the repetitious character of the arguments, which clarifies why the percentage of abbreviation grows as the text proceeds (Gray, 'Additions', p. 425).

The translator's general approach to the parent text has dramatic consequences on both the macro- and micro-level. In terms of the former, a good example is ch. 28, the famous 'Wisdom poem' in the Hebrew. Not only does the translator abbreviate the text by half, passing over vv. 3b-4a, 5-9a, 14-19, 21b-22a, 26b-27a, but the point of the poem, namely, that all things have a place of origin, is subsumed under Job's remarks about the lot of the impious, which begin in 27.13. The translator passes over 27.21-23, and adds the connector 'for' at the head of 28.1, so that we read, 'Pain came upon him (the impious) like water, and gloom carried him off by night. (28.1) For...'. The 'for' or 'because' (*γάρ*) explains that the catastrophe of the impious is rooted in the retributive ways of the Lord.

Innumerable examples can be offered of the translator's treatment of the text at the individual phrase and verse level. One or two must suffice. At 1.5 the translator specifies the sacrifices Job offered by adding, 'and one bull calf as a sin offering for their souls', and emphasises Job's concern for his children's piety by interpreting 'It may be that my children have sinned, and cursed God in their hearts' (NRSV) as 'Perhaps my sons thought bad things in their mind toward God'. 'The Sabeans' are generalised as 'the marauders' (1.17), and the Chaldeans as 'horsemen' (1.17); Eliphaz and Sophar are identified as 'kings', and Baldad as a 'tyrant' (2.11). In 3.5, the translator passes over 'let the blackness of...terrify it' and takes 'the day' at the end of v. 5 with v. 6, so 'May that day...'.²

A notable feature of the translator's work is the use of 'associative translations',² that is, instances where he replaces a translation of the parent text with parts of verses drawn from elsewhere in Job or from elsewhere in the LXX corpus. For example, 'like a premature birth that

2. The term 'associative translation' is borrowed from Targumic studies. See Kvam, 'Come', p. 99 n. 5, citing Klein, 'Associative', pp. 134*-40*.

comes from a mother's womb' (3.16a) derives from Num. 12.12; 'That is, he breathed on them and they withered' (4.21a) from Isa. 40.24; 'who fears his master' (7.2a) from Job 3.19; 'I know that you can do anything, and nothing is impossible for you' (10.13) from Job 42.2; 'the short-lived offspring of woman' (11.2; cf. v. 12) from 14.1; 'who will say to him, "What did you do?"' (11.10b) from 9.12. Passages drawn upon from outside Job come from Greek Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Isaiah, and perhaps Psalms.

Another trait of the LXX Job translator is the use of metathesis to ferret out the meaning of the Hebrew text. That is, occasionally the translator reorders the Hebrew consonants. For example, at 21.10b he has read כשל 'falter' instead of שכל 'miscarry' (see further NETS, p. 668). The latter, as is often the case, is not a rare word, so that the translator works to identify the possibilities inherent in the text with slight changes.

These remarks about the general character of LXX Job reveal a translator who is also a creative editor.

II. Time and Place of Translation

The LXX corpus is, for the most part, a product of Alexandrian Judaism. Alexandria was the economic and cultural centre of Egypt and the most important city in the Hellenistic Greek world for the study of literature; it also had a large and vibrant Jewish community. As for the translation of Job into Greek, no other provenance has been suggested.

It is possible that the date of translation is as early as the mid-second century B.C.E. (Cox, 'Historical'), but probably it is somewhat later. Our earliest attestation for the OG translation of Job is its use in Aristeas' *On the Jews*, excerpted by Alexander Polyhistor. The fragment identifies Job with Jobab (Gen. 36.33), like the ending of Job; that Aristeas is using the Greek translation of Job is clear from the use of the titles 'king' and 'tyrant' in identifying the three friends. Polyhistor wrote about the middle of the first century B.C.E., so that Aristeas lived in the first half of that century at the latest. LXX Job must belong to that period or a bit earlier (so *BGS*, p. 91).

The freedom with which the translator treats the text of Job invites comparison with the relative textual fluidity of several other books. The stories about Daniel (1–6) were supplemented with apocalyptic materials

(7–12) in the mid-second century B.C.E. and then by the stories ‘Susanna’ and ‘Bel and the Dragon.’ Liturgical materials were added to Daniel (‘Prayer of Azarias’ and the ‘Song of the Three Young Men’ in ch. 3), as well as to Esther (the prayer of Mardocheaios and Esther and its answer, plus four other additions; see NETS, pp. 424–25). The book of Jeremiah circulated in a longer and shorter, differently arranged edition (attested by the OG and 4QJer^b 4QJer^d) and was expanded by the addition of Baruch and the ‘Letter of Jeremiah’. The Greek Psalter includes a 151st psalm, has some different organisation within (e.g., Hebrew psalms 9 and 10 are combined), and the ongoing process of historicisation of individual psalms is reflected in the larger number of Greek psalms with superscriptions. Finally, we may note the editing of materials in 2 Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah to produce the books of 1 and 2 Esdras, the former including a story of three youths who served as bodyguards for King Darius (NETS, p. 392).

LXX Proverbs, whose translation is in some ways like that of Job, represents a text that has been re-arranged and supplemented in contrast to its parent text. All this is to say that the nature of the translation of Job is part of a larger context, where ‘biblical’ texts could still be treated with relative freedom, at least outside the Torah.

Finally, the ‘time’ of translation serves to explain another feature of LXX Job, and of the LXX more generally. Joosten has drawn our attention to the fact that sometimes the Greek translation is different in meaning from the MT because the former reflects the meaning of words in *late* Hebrew. The best example from Job is the use of σπουδάζω ‘hasten’ to render בִּהַל, which in Classical Hebrew means ‘be terrified; terrify’, but in *late* Hebrew can mean ‘make haste, be eager’ (for Job, see NETS at 4.5; 21.6; 22.10; 23.16; 31.5). The Greek rendering becomes easily explicable with this awareness (Joosten, ‘Translators’ Knowledge’, p. 173; on σπεύδω / σπουδάζω, see Taylor, ‘Hebrew to Greek’).

III. Language

The book of Job is a literary document. Its OG translation is, in the first instance, a translation: it is literature in translation. That means there is always a parent text to reckon with, a parent text that to a greater or lesser degree determines, shapes, limits and controls what is to be found

in its rendering from Hebrew into Greek. At the same time, LXX Job is written in ‘good’ Greek, and betrays less interference from the parent text than much of the LXX. It is not isomorphic, contains relatively few awkward constructions syntactically, presents a varied and learned vocabulary, and reflects a conscious effort to present the story of Job in a new literary environment. However, in my opinion the translation was intended for the Jewish community that read it, not for the broader Greek world, Alexandrian, Egyptian or beyond.

Reading Greek Job over against its parent text, one is struck by the translator’s addition of so many connecting particles that function to tie the text together, give balance to clauses and to enliven it with little shifts of nuance. The translator has a special fondness for *δέ* ‘but; and’ and *γάρ* ‘for’. The latter is added about one hundred times; the former about two hundred and fifty times. The preference for *δέ* over the common connector *καί* ‘and’ is a stylistic preference. *καί* is the conjunction of choice for rendering the conjunction ו ‘and’ in chs. 1–2, but by ch. 5, *δέ* has taken over. Further, in good Hellenistic style, the translator likes to pile up particles. No example is more striking than the use of *οὐ μὴν δὲ ἀλλὰ*, usually rendered ‘nonetheless’ in NETS (2.5a; 5.8a; 12.6a; 13.3a; 17.10a; 21.17a; 27.7a; 33.1a—at 12.6; 21.17 and 27.7 it is an addition; see Cox, ‘Tying’).

Second, the translator has favourite words, which he is able to introduce with little attention to the precise meaning of words in the parent text. These include such verbs as *ἀπαλλάσσω* ‘remove’ (3.10; 7.15; 9.12, 34; 10.19; 27.5; 34.5) and *τιτρώσκω* ‘wound’ (6.9; 16.6; 20.24; 33.23; 36.14, 25; 41.20), and phrases like *τὰ σῖτα ζητέω* ‘seek grain’ (6.5; 38.41; 39.29; also *ζητέω βοράν* ‘seek prey’ at 9.26), *χράομαι* ‘use’ (13.20; 23.6; 30.14; 34.20; *χράομαι ὀργῇ* ‘treat with anger’ [10.17; 16.9; 19.11]), and *δαίτια* ‘way of life; dwelling’ (5.24 and eleven other times; examples from Ziegler, ‘Der textkritische Wert’). Such favoured vocabulary does not prevent him from using words that are *hapax legomena* in the LXX corpus (for example, *δμείρομαι* ‘long for, desire’ [3.21]) or words that are rarely attested in extant Greek literature (e.g., *ἐπιφάυσκω* ‘shine’ [25.5; 31.26; 41.10]). To cite but a few other examples, *ἄμφιασις* ‘clothing’ (22.6; 24.7; 38.9) and *παρέλκυσις* ‘delay’ (25.3) are first known in Job; *ναίω* ‘dwell’ (22.12) occurs only here in the LXX; *πιστεύω κατὰ* ‘feel secure about’ (24.22) is a rare collocation in Greek.

The nature of the translation of Job means that we should look for its use of language among Greek authors like Homer, Xenophon, Plato, Demosthenes, Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Demetrius, and not so much among the everyday language of non-literary papyri. But that is not to say LXX Job is Hellenistic Koine to such a degree that one does not see examples of linguistic interference from the Hebrew side. Some examples of such interference are: *σκία θανάτου* ‘deathly shadow’, literally, ‘shadow of death’ (3.5; 12.22); *θυμὸς ὀργῆς* ‘a terrible wrath’, literally ‘a wrath of anger’ (3.17; 20.23; 31.11); *θαυμάζω πρόσωπα* ‘make favourite of’ (22.8; 34:19); and the use of *πρὸ προσώπου μου* ‘before my face’ (23.17), where the underlying Hebrew is *מִפְנֵי*, literally ‘from my face’.

In the case of the last example, it is just possible that this ‘Hebraism’, which occurs only here in Job, is used deliberately and is intended to recall passages where the angel of the Lord goes before the people (Exod. 23.20) or where the Lord does great acts before them (Exod. 34.24). Such examples indicate that Job too is literature in translation from a Semitic parent text.

IV. Translation and Composition

LXX Job does not employ stereotypical equivalences in the translation of the parent text. The study of the book’s translation technique constantly bears this in mind. What usually obtains in the Pentateuch, for example, or to cite a more extreme case, Psalms, cannot be expected in Job. To consult the concordance of Hatch and Redpath for the translator’s use of particular Greek words time and time again reveals that, in Job, the Greek word does not have the same meaning at all as the Hebrew word cited as underlying it. Indeed, often Hatch and Redpath mark the use of Greek words in Job with a dagger (†), indicating that the matter of equivalence is unclear and the researcher should check the passage for himself or herself. To cite an example, again taken at random, in H-R the verb *δέιδω* ‘fear’ is cited as occurring nine times in the LXX corpus, eight of which are in Job. In one case it is a variant reading, so the true count is seven—and in five of those seven cases H-R have marked its use with a dagger! As a result, the researcher cannot expect any one equivalence to obtain.

Among scholarly studies, Orlinsky ('Studies', p. 69) in 1957 deemed Beer's analysis of Job from 1897 (*Text*) had not been superseded. Beer remains important for citing the work of earlier scholars, especially their retroversions of the OG into Hebrew, and for his own suggestions on the OG. If much of this work must be set aside because the character of the OG as translation is now better understood, Beer's work remains immensely suggestive. Dhorme's commentary surpassed the philological notes of Driver-Gray, taking over many of Beer's suggestions about how the Greek translator read the Hebrew—almost never with acknowledgement—and adding many of his own. More recently, the textual notes in the commentaries of Fohrer, Gordis and Clines are useful with respect to the OG. Gerleman, who edited Job for *BHS*, wrote a stimulating, relatively short work on Greek Job (*Studies*). Its most important contribution lies in his analysis of LXX Job as a Greek document, and his elucidation as such of its style and theology. Orlinsky wrote a series of informed articles on LXX Job ('Studies'), although much of this discussion is rendered dated by Ziegler's critical edition. He sometimes falls into the trap of his predecessors in assuming that the translator works with a 'rational' translation technique, deriving, on the basis of what obtains elsewhere in Job or the LXX, how the translator handled the Hebrew. He did lay to rest the assertion that anti-anthropomorphism has some major role in the translator's work, as had been set forth in Gard's book (*Exegetical*).

Much of this earlier work is almost always helpful, though those working before 1982 were without a critical edition of the OG. It goes without saying that Ziegler's edition is the single most important contribution to the study of the OG text of Job. Aside from the edition, Ziegler published, many years earlier, in 1934, an article on the textual value of LXX Job ('Der textkritische Wert') and, after the edition, a supplementary volume (*Beiträge*).

A recent monograph by Gorea is devoted to the shorter Greek text, asking whether there is something about the character of the Hebrew text that led the translator to omit lines, verses and passages (*Job Repensé*). Along the way stimulating commentary is provided on the Greek text.³

3. The book engages almost none of the scholarship on Job, not Beer or Dhorme or Heater, and not even Gentry and Pietersma on the demarcation of Theodotion in the

V. Key Text-Critical Issues

It should be clear that LXX Job is of limited use when it comes to the textual criticism of the underlying Hebrew text, a text that appears to have been similar to the MT. That has not prevented scholars in the past from so using the OG in Job, since the OG is an important textual witness in most books of the LXX, especially those that adhere to the interlinear paradigm. Job does not. Hebrew Bible scholars can be found citing the OG in support of some emendation of the Hebrew when, upon further analysis and reflection, it is more likely that the OG has offered some sort of interpretive rendering. To cite but one example, Dhorme, Fohrer and Clines all emend the Hebrew ‘his mouth’ to ‘his blossom’ at 15.30c on the basis of the OG, but closer examination of the OG shows that v. 30c is not a translation of the parent text but an informed paraphrase. See Dhorme, *A Commentary*, p. 223; Fohrer, *Hiob*, p. 264; Clines, *Job 1–20*, p. 344.

Having set that important issue aside, what are the key questions in the textual criticism of the OG itself? First, to recognise the paraphrastic, authorial approach of the translator, and, therefore, to resist imposing a translation technique that says, ‘This Hebrew must have been rendered in such and such a way; therefore the OG is corrupt and must be emended’. Not even Orlinsky, a Septuagint scholar, is free of this inclination to impose order upon the translator of Job.

A second crucial text-critical issue is an understanding of the text’s history, first, to demarcate and exclude Theodotion’s translation from consideration as Old Greek, and, second, to appreciate the nature of the Lucianic text. Thanks to Ziegler’s critical edition, the first task has largely been done for the reader of LXX Job.⁴ The earlier edition of Swete does not separate Theodotion from the OG, so one cannot see, apart from close examination, that what is presented as LXX Job is, in fact, a mixture of two quite different translations. Nor did Brenton’s widely used translation distinguish the two. We will return to this issue later, under § VII.

ecclesiastical text (except at 9.3b), which, one would think, is essential to her task. See the review of Gorea’s book in *BIOSCS* 43 (2010), pp. 130–32.

4. Gentry was able to make some slight changes to Ziegler’s demarcation of the work of Theodotion in the mixed text of Job. See *The Asterisked Materials*.

VI. Ideology and Exegesis

Every translator leaves something of his or her culture embedded in the text of the target language. To state an obvious truth, the document is now in another language and no two languages are precisely the same. In the case of the LXX, the languages involved belong to two entirely different groups of languages, Semitic and Indo-European. Often there are no precise equivalents. Sometimes in the case of Job, a given Hebrew word has several meanings and the translator has chosen a meaning different from that reflected in modern English translations. Or, the OG reflects a late Hebrew or Aramaic reading of the parent text.

LXX Job represents an interpretation of its parent text; it is an attempt to put that document into a different space, time and culture. This new location has different ways of thinking theologically. In the past much of the attention given to the religious teaching of the LXX Job translator was devoted to the study of so-called anti-anthropomorphisms—his resistance to speaking of God in human terms. This aspect of the translator's work was overemphasised to the neglect of much more significant areas of the translator's work.

There is a certain amount of 'levelling' that takes place in LXX Job as in the LXX more generally. Dodd noted this phenomenon years ago with respect to words for wrongdoing: a more varied vocabulary is reduced to fewer words (Dodd, *The Bible*, pp. 76–81; cf. Cox, 'Vocabulary'). The same happens with the names used for God. The translator usually employs κύριος 'Lord' for the various words meaning 'God' (^ʿEl, ^ʿEloah, ^ʿElohim), though note that in six of its seventeen occurrences ^ʿElohim is rendered by its Greek equivalent, θεός 'God'. The exotic word *Shaddai*, used 28 times in Job, is represented nine times by κύριος (6.4, 14; 13.3; 21.20; 22.3, 23, 26; 24.1; 31.35) and some sixteen times by παντοκράτωρ 'almighty' (e.g., 5.17; 8.5; 11.7), a term used in the Greek world, but not commonly so, as an attribute of the gods. Elsewhere in the LXX, παντοκράτωρ almost exclusively renders *sabaoth* '(of) armies, hosts'. With the choice of παντοκράτωρ a whole new world of meaning arrives.

LXX Job betrays exegetical clues reflective of its place of origin. For example, the use of οἶκος 'house' for לְהָא 'tent' (5.24a; 20.26) points to the translator's urban background; στρατηγός 'commander, general' for מֶלֶךְ 'king' (15.24) offers a word well-known in military contexts in the Hellenistic period; φορόλογος 'tax-gatherer' for שׂוֹנֵן 'driver' (39.7) hints

at the ubiquity of the tax office in Egypt at the time. As intriguing as these translations are, they do not qualify as ideological or as theological. Two significant examples of the latter may be cited, the less so first.

Notable, first, is the use of the word *δυνάστης* ‘ruler, prince, petty chief’ among the vocabulary for wrongdoing in Job. At vv. 6.23, 15.20 and 27.13 the translator uses *δυνάστης* for *רַעֲיוֹן* ‘ruthless’. In the latter two passages, Eliphaz and Job, respectively, are describing the lot of ‘the wicked’ and ‘the ruthless’ (15.20) and ‘the wicked’ and ‘oppressors’ (27.13). The underlying Hebrew in both cases is *רַעֲיוֹן* // *רַשָׁעִים* and the OG is *ἀσεβής* ‘impious’ // *δυνάστης*. At 6.23 the word *ἐχθρός* ‘enemy’ is parallel to *δυνάστης*. That is, the powerful are ranged with the impious and enemies against those loyal to the Lord, people such as Job.

Second, there is the role of *nomos* ‘law’ in Job. In Greek Job *ἀνομία* ‘lawlessness’ and its cognates—which occur 25 times in Job—translate five different Hebrew words. That is to say, ‘lawlessness’ is an umbrella term for words having to do with sin and injustice: sin *is* lawlessness. As significantly, the translator adds the adjective *ἄνομος* ‘unlawful’ and the verb *παρανομέω* ‘transgress’ five times to the text (5.22; 12.5; 34.17, 18; 35.14—all are marked with a dagger in H-R), indicating the importance of the law for the translator’s understanding of Job’s situation. What has Job done to deserve his fate? He is guilty of breaking the law.

In the Psalms and Wisdom books, including Job, translators use the word *ἀσέβεια* ‘impiety’ to render the Hebrew word *רַשָׁע* ‘wickedness’. ‘Wickedness’ in these books is understood as impiety, a lack of religious sensibility, a failure in matters of religion. *ἀσέβεια* and its cognate adjective and verb appear some 43 times in Job; in 90% of the cases the underlying Hebrew is *רַשָׁע*, adjective (e.g., 3.17; 8.22; 9.24) or verb (9.29; 10.15; 32.3; 34.18 [MT v. 17]). In Greek Job, lawlessness and impiety are one and the same: Job insists, ‘I have not sinned or *acted impiously* or shared a way with *doers of lawless acts*, to walk with *the impious*’ (34.8).

The word *νομός* is used generally of the way things are, the orderliness that undergirds society, and of law in a narrower sense (Burn, *Pelican History*, p. 251).⁵ According to LXX Job, our protagonist has offended the

5. ‘*Nomos*: law or custom or convention’. This and the following page in Burn, with references to Herodotus, Plato and Aristophanes, are well worth reading with respect to Greek Job.

proper order of things in some way. As a result he is impious. In this he has good company, since, in the Greek world of thought, both Socrates and Aristotle were charged with impiety (*ἀσεβεια*).

If *νομός* and *ἀσεβής* bring Job into the Greek world, its social and literary context ensures that ‘law’ is understood as the Law of Moses. For Greek Job belongs to the Alexandrian Jewish community first and foremost, not to the Greek world. This is clear from the beginning of the book, at 1.5, where Job’s religious life, his piety, is understood in terms of the book of Leviticus (‘and one bull calf as a sin offering for their souls’).

VII. Reception History

The first extant copy of LXX Job is represented by the fragmentary papyrus POxy. 3522, dated to the first century C.E.; it contains 42.11-12.⁶ The next is (Rahlfs number) 974, a papyrus dated to about 220 and containing 33.23-24 and 34.10c; after that papyrus 955, fourth century, which preserves 1.19–2.1; 2.6-9b. With the fourth century complete manuscripts are extant, namely, the great uncial manuscript Vaticanus and its sister witness, Sinaiticus; and, a century later, Alexandrinus.

The textual tradition of Greek Job is dominated by the work of Origen (d. 254) and Lucian (d. 312). The original OG translation of Job is an abbreviated, edited, supplemented, paraphrased interpretation of the longer Hebrew parent text. Origen, in his huge project, the Hexapla, using a rather mechanical approach added to the Greek Job that he had at hand the hundreds of lines lacking—adding them from the translation that bears the name of Theodotion. That column incorporating his work, that fifth column of the Hexapla, with its mixed text, its elements demarcated by asterisks, *obeli*, and *metobeli*, became so popular that it corrupted almost the entire textual tradition of Greek Job. Aside from some patristic commentators, the only witness to escape Origen’s work is the translation made into Sahidic, in Egypt. The Sahidic is our sole almost-complete (it lacks 39.10–40.13) witness to the shorter, original text of Greek Job.

6. This papyrus, published in 1983, is not collated in Ziegler’s edition, which appeared the previous year.

Origen's attempt to produce a Greek text aligned with the Hebrew faced several insurmountable challenges in the case of Job. Sometimes the translator paraphrases in such a way that two lines are reduced to one: which line should now be added? The translator replaces whole lines with lines from elsewhere, in which case the Greek has no resemblance to the Hebrew: what is going on? It happens that Origen can add a 'missing' line, which, upon inspection, instead duplicates with Theodotion a line already represented in the Old Greek: the result is a double translation, and no translation at all for the line that is, in fact, not translated in the OG. To cite some examples: at 16.9-10, the translator added a line (OG 9c), translated MT v. 9c, which becomes OG v. 10a, and omitted MT v. 10a, so that OG vv. 9-10 are equal in lines to the Hebrew but, now, quite different from it (complicated!); OG 19.13c is a second translation of MT v. 13b; 23.14 is not represented in the Hexaplaric text at all, for the OG passed over v. 14, but Origen believed that v. 15 was lacking and added Theodotion v. 15 so that the ecclesiastical text has two translations of v. 15 and none of v. 14. Finally, Theodotion's translation does follow the interlinear paradigm; the result of Origen's work is a text that adds to a paraphrase like, let us say, the Living Bible, several hundred lines from a literalistic translation like the American Standard Bible.

The textual tradition of LXX Job reached a third stage with the revision by Lucian of Antioch. In the case of Job, Lucian based his editorial work on the Hexaplaric text. We know this because Theodotion's translation, used to supplement the OG in the Hexapla, shows the same kind of revision as the larger, original OG component. Lucian's revision of the text of Job does not reflect an attempt to bring the text closer to the Hebrew. No, we would have to say it is stylistic in nature: grammatical corrections, the addition of syntactical markers, the replacement of words with synonyms, the addition of words such as possessive pronouns in the interest of clarity, changes in vocabulary towards the more appropriate or in order to fit the context, and, finally, changes in person that sometimes dramatically affect the reading of the text (see Cox, 'Nature', p. 429). The main *L* (Lucianic) group of witnesses in Job consists of MSS Alexandrinus (fifth century), 575 (thirteenth), 637 (eleventh); the fourth-century commentators Julian the Arian and Chrysostom; and the Armenian version (early fifth). It is this well-worked type of text (i.e. OG + Origen's work + Lucian) that becomes the *textus receptus* for Greek Job.

An awareness of these textual developments is imperative for whatever use one makes of Greek Job. From the start one must set aside the additions made by Origen. Unfortunately even Ziegler tends to present the ecclesiastical text as one text: the Hexaplaric signs are there, but the typeface of the Theodotonic element is the same as that for the OG and the two are punctuated as one text.⁷ NETS puts Theodotion in italics within square brackets and does not punctuate it with the OG. Theodotion remains ‘in’ the text rather than in footnotes or gathered together at the end or, more radically, left out altogether. This is a compromise, made for the sake of NETS users. As for Lucian, Ziegler’s edition permits one to readily identify the Lucianic revision in the apparatus and to assess its textual character. For a comprehensive summary of the question addressed in this section, see Botte and Bogaert, ‘Septante’.

Bibliography

- Beer, G., *Der Text des Buches Hiob* (Marburg: N.G. Elwertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1897).
- Botte, B., and P.-M. Bogaert, ‘Septante et Versions grecques’, in J. Briend and É. Cothenet (eds.), *Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible* (Tom 12, Fasc. 68; Paris: Letouzey & Ané, 1993), cols. 624–27 (‘Job’).
- Burn, A.R., *The Pelican History of Greece* (repr. with revisions; Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, first printed, 1965; repr. with revisions 1976).
- Clines, D.J.A., *Job 1–20* (WBC; Nashville: Nelson, 1989).
- Cox, C.E., ‘The Historical, Social and Literary Context of Old Greek Job’, in M.K.H. Peters (ed.), *XII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Leiden 2004* (SBLSCS 54; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), pp. 105–16.
- ‘The Nature of Lucian’s Revision of the Text of Greek Job’, in A. Voitila and J. Jokiranti (eds.), *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls* (Festschrift R. Sollamo; JSJSup 126; Leiden: Brill, 2008), pp. 423–42.
- ‘Tying It All Together: The Use of Particles in Old Greek Job’, *BIOSCS* 38 (2005), pp. 41–54.

7. The problems initiated by the decision to print as lemma the composite, ecclesiastical text are noted by A. Pietersma in his review, published in *JBL* 104 (1985), pp. 305–11, esp. 306–7.

- Vocabulary for Wrongdoing and Forgiveness in the Greek Translations of Job', *Textus* 15 (1990), pp. 119–30.
- Dhorme, E., *A Commentary on the Book of Job* (trans. H. Knight; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1967; original French, 1926).
- Dodd, C.H., *The Bible and the Greeks* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1935; 3rd impression, 1964).
- Driver, S.R., and G.B. Gray, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Job* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1921).
- Fernández Marcos, N., 'The Septuagint Reading of the Book of Job', in W.A.M. Beuken (ed.), *The Book of Job* (BETL 114; Leuven: Peeters, 1994), pp. 251–66.
- Fohrer, G., *Das Buch Hiob* (KAT; Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1963).
- Gammie, J.G., 'The Angelology and Demonology in the Septuagint of the Book of Job', *HUCA* 56 (1985), pp. 1–19.
- Gard, D.H., *The Exegetical Method of the Greek Translator of the Book of Job* (JBLMS 8; Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature, 1952; repr. 1967).
- Gentry, P., *The Asterisked Materials in the Greek Job* (SBLSCS 38; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995).
- Gerleman, G., *Studies in the Septuagint. I. Book of Job* (Lunds Universitets Arsskrift, N.F. Avd. 1., Bd. 43, nr. 2; Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1946).
- Gordis, R., *The Book of Job: Commentary, New Translation, Special Studies* (Moreshet Series 2; New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 1978).
- Gorea, M., *Job Repensé ou Trahi? Omissions et raccourcis de la Septante* (Études Bibliques, Nouvelle Série 56; Paris: Gabalda, 2007).
- Gray, G.B., 'The Additions in the Ancient Greek Version of Job', *Expositor* 19 (1920), pp. 422–38.
- Heater, H., *A Septuagint Translation Technique in the Book of Job* (CBQMS 11; Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1982).
- Joosten, J., 'On the LXX Translators' Knowledge of Hebrew', in B.A. Taylor (ed.), *X Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies (Oslo, 1998)* (SBLSCS 51; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2001), pp. 165–79.
- Kepper, M., and M. Witte, 'Job. Das Buch Ijob/Hiob', in M. Karrer and W. Kraus (eds.), *Septuaginta Deutsch. Erläuterungen und Kommentare zum griechischen Alten Testament*, vol. II (2 vols.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2011), pp. 2041–2126.
- Klein, M.L., 'Associative and Complementary Translation in the Targums', *Eretz Israel* 16; (1982), pp. 134–40.
- Kvam, B.O.G., "'Come, Let the Two of Us Go Out into the Field": The Targum Supplement to Genesis 4:8a—A Text-Immanent Reading?', in P.V.M. Flesher (ed.), *Targum and Scripture: Studies in Aramaic Translations and Interpretation* (Festschrift E.G. Clarke; SAIC 2; Leiden: Brill, 2002), pp. 97–103.

The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint

- Orlinsky, H.M., 'Studies in the Septuagint of the Book of Job', *HUCA* 28 (1957), pp. 53–74; 29 (1958), pp. 229–71; 30 (1959), pp. 153–67; 32 (1961), pp. 239–68; 33 (1962), pp. 119–51; 35 (1964), pp. 57–78; 36 (1965), pp. 37–47.
- Reed, A.Y., 'Job as Jobab: The Interpretation of Job in LXX Job 42:17b-e', *JBL* 120 (2001), pp. 31–55.
- Taylor, B.A., 'Hebrew to Greek: A Semantic Study of *σπεύδω* for the New English Translation of the Septuagint', in B.A. Taylor, J.A.L. Lee, P.R. Burton, and R.E. Whitaker (eds.), *Biblical Greek Language and Lexicography* (Festschrift F.W. Danker; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), pp. 136–48.
- Würthwein, E., *The Text of the Old Testament: An Introduction to the Biblia Hebraica* (2nd ed.; trans. E.F. Rhodes; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995).
- Ziegler, J., *Beiträge zum griechischen Job* (AKWG Philologisch-Historische Klasse, Dritte Folge 147; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985).
- 'Der textkritische Wert der Septuaginta des Buches Job: Miscell.', *Bib* 2 (1934), pp. 284–85; republished as *Sylloge. Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Septuaginta* (MSU 10; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971), pp. 16–17.
- Ziegler, J. (ed.), *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum*. Vol. XI.4, *Job* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982).

Wisdom of Solomon

James K. Aitken

Editions

(a) Standard Greek Editions

- Göttingen, vol. XII.1, *Sapientia Salomonis* (J. Ziegler, 1980, 2nd ed.).
- Rahlfs-Hanhart, vol. II, pp. 345–76.
- Swete, vol. II, pp. 604–43.

(b) Modern Translations

- NETS (Knibb, 2007), pp. 697–714.
- LXX.D (Engel, 2009), pp. 1057–89.

I. General Characteristics

The Wisdom of Solomon is a work that presents Jewish thought and the reading of the Bible in philosophical terms. It is clear from the subject matter and the sophistication of the language that it was a composition in Greek, and it most likely derives from Jewish philosophical circles in Alexandria. It presents key concepts in Judaism through Greek philosophy, with a particular focus on the afterlife (and specifically the Platonic resurrection of the soul) as a response to suffering, the nature of wisdom, the fate and death of the wicked, and the problem of idolatry. These ideas are sometimes presented in disputational terms aimed either at those holding alternative positions (such as in ch. 2) or at other peoples who practise them (such as the Egyptians and their idolatry). Such polemic is in part typical of philosophical schools and need not be seen as direct evidence of the social positioning of the author towards his

neighbours. The author presents a highly educated reading of the biblical narratives of the Exodus and a fine exposition of Jewish beliefs in the period.

The attribution to Solomon derives from his famed wisdom and the authorial speech of the king in ch. 7. The title ‘Wisdom of Solomon’ is found in the main Greek codices (ABSV), while the Old Latin (*Vetus Latina*) reads merely *Liber sapientiae* ‘Book of Wisdom’. The Peshitta terms it ‘the book of great wisdom’.

II. Time and Place of Composition

There is little doubt that the author of Wisdom was based in Alexandria. The high degree of literary sophistication and his education in Hellenistic philosophy locate him in the intellectual circles of that city. He joins a tradition of Jewish philosophers from Alexandria, most famously represented by Philo, but in a tradition going back through Artapanus (third to second century B.C.E.), Aristobulus (second century), the author of *Aristeas* (second century), and Philo’s implied opponents, and continuing later in 4 Maccabees (first to second century C.E.). His focus (in chs. 11–18) on the Exodus and the practice of the Egyptians would also support Egypt as the general location of the writing.

A precise date is impossible to pinpoint for the book. Considerable attention has been focussed on the possible allusions to the Romans or to particular persecutions of the Jews in Egypt, although the language and philosophy too have been brought forward for proposed dates. Some seek to place the work in the first century B.C.E., sometime in the early period of Roman rule of Egypt, 31–10 B.C.E. (Larcher, *Sagesse*, vol. I, pp. 148–61). Larcher’s attempt to invoke quotations from LXX Isaiah in 2.12 (Isa. 3.10) and 15.10 (Isa. 44.20) and the apparent allusions to *I En.* 5.7 (Wis. 3.9) offer no more than an imprecise *terminus post quem* (cf. critique of Grabbe, *Wisdom*, p. 88). Likewise the suggestion that some New Testament passages are dependent on Wisdom is not beyond doubt.

Those who seek a date in the first century C.E. advocate the reign of Caligula (37–41 C.E.) as the most likely option (Winston, *Wisdom*, pp. 20–25; Cheon, *Exodus*) pointing to the persecutions during this time. They view the hostility expressed in the book, and the tale of the

suffering righteous person (chs. 2–6) as a response to the Jewish riots in Alexandria after Caligula tried to impose his cult statue in Jerusalem (recounted in Philo, *Embassy*). The apocalyptic passage on divine military vengeance on God’s enemies (5.16–23) would then relate to the time of Caligula and his threat to Judaism. As there is little evidence that Jews were persecuted under the Ptolemies, such a scenario would better fit the Roman period (Grabbe, *Wisdom*, p. 89), although it is difficult to differentiate a historical event from the biblical type of a suffering individual (Isa. 53). Hints of a Roman context have also been pointed to in the themes and phraseology. It has been suggested that the ‘domination’ (κράτησις, Wis. 6.3) given to rulers applies specifically to Roman rule, but this can be doubted. The passage on remote rulers being worshipped through their statues could allude to the Roman Imperial cult as well, but like all the other examples it is not precise. The omission of names for any of the figures in the book, whether Solomon himself or the biblical characters alluded to (ch. 10), has also been seen as a device in times of trouble (Cheon, ‘Anonymity’). No passage is explicit, nevertheless, in its reference to Caligula or his actions.

Language has been seen as a surer guide to date (Grabbe, *Wisdom*, p. 89: the ‘strongest argument’) and Winston, using observations by Scarpata (*Libro*) and others, has drawn up a list of 35 or more words in *Wisdom* that do not appear in our records before the first century C.E. (*Wisdom*, p. 22 and n. 33). The chance survival of words in fragmentary sources for Greek prevents definitive conclusions, but this is a significant number. However, some of his evidence is bound to be overturned by the ongoing publication of papyri and inscriptions and the significant new words to be found therein (cf. Aitken, *No Stone*). In at least one case (δεκαμηνιαῖος, 7.2) the date of the first appearance of the word in an inscription (IKyme 41.18) is now to be dated earlier (first century B.C.E.) than Winston allowed (Aitken, *No Stone*, pp. 49–50). Other words are natural compound formations in Greek or derivations from well-known words, but which probably only by chance have made no appearance in the ancient record. Thus Winston’s example of the noun ἵνδαλμα ‘form, appearance’ (Wis. 17.3; and known already in Jer. 27.39) is a derivative of the verb ἰνδάλλομαι ‘to appear, seem’, which was in use since Homer. The one pre-Christian example of the noun (early fourth century B.C.E.) in an epitaph from Attica (SEG 30:264.1–2) is a textual reconstruction

(on the basis of the later IG II² 12142) and therefore cannot be relied upon. It does offer hope for finding earlier attestations and is a reminder that derivatives can arise at any point in time. The vocabulary, then, is suggestive for the date of the book, but sure results cannot be based upon it.

Less often has the philosophy been used as a means of dating the book, other than the general observation that it can be classed as part of Middle Platonism, a form of Platonic philosophy that developed in the first century B.C.E. and continued afterwards. This does not give a precise date. The similarities to Philo are detailed by Winston throughout his commentary (*Wisdom*, esp. pp. 59–63) and this suggests the author was close in time and thought to Philo. Engberg-Pedersen (*Cosmology*, pp. 22–26), however, has put forward the strongest argument that *Wisdom* preceded Philo. For, in *Wisdom* we find an attachment to Stoic ideas of materiality combined with Platonic immateriality, including though a rejection of Stoic concepts of God (§ VI). This attachment to Stoic ideas combined with a rejection of some does not reflect the full development and synthesis that is found in Philo and Middle Platonism. If *Wisdom* then precedes Philo, he could be placed in the first century B.C.E.

III. Language

The distinctive nature of some of the vocabulary of *Wisdom* has already been noted (§ II), reflecting its independence from the Septuagint and the likelihood that it is a Greek composition. Much of its vocabulary is philosophical (fully surveyed by Reese, *Hellenistic*) and would not have a natural equivalent in Hebrew or Aramaic. The book also reflects some rhetorical and poetic techniques of Greek, including word plays and litotes (Léonas, ‘Poetics’, pp. 101–103). It is standard Koine, but of a literary level, using particles and subordinate clauses.

Nevertheless, the language could be said to be of a mixed nature, combining biblical themes, and therefore language, with philosophical words and expressions. Thus, while the Greek is literary and often sophisticated, it also exhibits features typical of the Septuagint. This is in part owing to the subject matter, a form of biblical interpretation, but also perhaps owing to the status of the LXX and the standard it

provides as a literary ‘style’. Indeed, Wisdom provides a useful demonstration of how the language of the LXX influences composition Greek.

Undoubtedly there is much influence in vocabulary from the LXX as the author draws on the work for his comparison. Some of it is subtle, such as the ready use of terms like *πνεῦμα* and *ψυχή* that are common in the LXX but also have a philosophical purpose—a ready synthesis for the author. At times words are chosen for their biblical allusion, as in the case of *οικήτωρ* ‘inhabitant’ (Wis. 12.3), alluding to Prov. 2.21 as a justification for the expulsion of the Canaanites (Aitken, ‘Jewish Use’). However, Léonas has shown how the author also draws upon LXX style and yet uses forms that are not attested in the LXX (‘Poetics’, pp. 114–23). This indicates its nature as a free composition, but also how the biblical text and its style of translation has had an influence. Even its use of parallelism, typical of a biblical work (Reymond, ‘Poetry’), includes examples not attested anywhere in the Bible.

In addition to the philosophical vocabulary, something of the context could be inferred from other terms (cf. § VI). Greek cultic vocabulary, such as *ἀνώνυμος* ‘nameless’ (14.27) and *ἀψύχος* ‘lifeless’ (13.17; 14.29), is found alongside more specific vocabulary of mystery cults (Grabbe, *Wisdom*, p. 36): *μύστας* ‘an initiate in the mysteries’, *σπλαγχοφάγος* ‘eating the innards’, *θοῖνα* ‘feast’, and *θίασος* ‘revel’ (12.5).

IV. Translation and Composition

It is clear from the philosophical themes and vocabulary, and the use of compound words, that Wisdom is a Greek composition and not a translation from a Semitic source (Reese, *Hellenistic*). The rare attempts to suggest it is a translation have been unsuccessful.

The structure of the book has been the subject of some debate, but some broad divisions can be easily identified. It falls into two main halves, chs. 1–9 focussing on Wisdom and its role, and chs. 10–19 examining the history of Israel and especially God’s role in the deliverance of Israel and the destruction of the Egyptians. The precise transition between the two halves is uncertain, some seeing it after ch. 10. The two halves are closely connected by related vocabulary and themes, so that the book can be seen as a unity. More precisely, chs. 1.2–6.21 are the book of eschatology presenting the justification of an afterlife of the soul

for those who are righteous, and death for those who do not recognise justice. The book then proceeds to a presentation of the nature of Wisdom (and the figure of Solomon in 7–8), largely in Platonic terms (6.22–10.21). It concludes with the historical review, which draws upon the eschatological themes from the start of the book (11.1–19.22). This considers the role of Wisdom in history (10–12), in which ch. 10 serves as a transition connecting backwards to the presentation of the nature of Wisdom and forwards to the historical review. The problem of idolatry, especially as practiced by the Egyptians, is outlined (13–15) and the death of the Egyptians in the Red Sea is recounted in detail (16–19, including a discussion of role of cosmology as serving God’s purposes). One transition is marked in ch. 6.1 through the repetition from 1.1 of an address to rulers to listen and understand (based on Psalm 2), stimulated by the reference to earthly rulers in 5.23. It serves as a transition between the two parts on Wisdom, the first with emphasis on eschatological wisdom, the second sapiential (Larcher, *Sagesse*, vol. I, p. 399).

V. Key Text-Critical Issues

There are few textual problems with the sources for Wisdom, and the manuscript evidence falls into the standard groups (described in detail by Ziegler, Göttingen; summarised by Winston, *Wisdom*, pp. 64–66). The Greek witnesses follow the standard division into Uncials, an Origenic revision, and a Lucianic version. The earliest manuscript of Wisdom is from Egypt, Antinoopolis papyrus 8, dated to the third century. The best witnesses are Vaticanus (B) and Sinaiticus (S), which are so similar to be one witness, and Alexandrinus (A). Other codices are less reliable as textual witnesses. Codex Ephraemi Syri rescriptus (a fifth-century palimpsest) is only partially preserved and contains many omissions, while Venetus from the eighth century has many scribal errors. Also of value is the commentary by Malachias Monachus (fourteenth century) since he makes use of Greek manuscripts that are unknown today. The *Vetus Latina* remains very important for Wisdom, as it was not modified by Jerome and therefore preserves a reading of the text earlier than the Greek witnesses. It still contains many doublets, but even then is of prime importance.

The Peshitta is generally considered to be unreliable as a text-critical resource, and although fragments of a Syro-Palestinian version have been preserved, these are largely dependent on the Peshitta. The Syro-hexapla is an important witness as it testifies to the fifth column of Origen's Hexapla, and particularly valuable is the Hexaplaric miniscule 253.

There are few obvious textual corruptions and emendation is necessary only occasionally. At times the syntax seems to break down, implying the text is corrupt (e.g., 12.4).

VI. Ideology and Exegesis

The book of Wisdom is a rich complex of ideas and themes. The tendency has been to infer sociological conclusions from its condemnation of idolatry and portrayal of the destruction of the Egyptians, but these passages need to be seen within the philosophical message of the book as a whole. The opening of the book presents the opportunities of immortality for those who are truly wise and death for the wicked. The focus on the fate of the Egyptians, then, is presented as an allegory and illustration of this philosophical position. Attempts to place the book in a world where Jews were uncomfortable in their Hellenistic environment or where young Jews had to be won back to the faith from philosophy (cf. Winston, *Wisdom*; Reese, *Hellenistic*) obscure the teaching role of the Bible for Jewish philosophical belief. The author is deeply educated in both Greek and philosophy, and is representative of a Jew at home in the Hellenistic world, rather than opposed to it.

From the very opening chapter the author presents his position, synthesising biblical interpretation (cf. Enns, 'Pseudo-Solomon') and Greek philosophy. He describes the creation of the world, reflecting themes from Genesis but expressed through Stoic materialism. The spirit of God in Genesis is equated with the Stoic concept of *πνεῦμα* 'spirit' (1.6-7), which is then combined with a Platonic immaterialism (7.15-8.1).

The author is representative of Jewish philosophical movements in Alexandria (§ II), even if many of the themes such as idolatry, justice, future life, condemnation of the Canaanites and wisdom's role in the history of Israel express facets of Jewish identity. It is possible that the author reflects a particular manifestation of Jewish practice, notable

through his use of cultic vocabulary (§ III). The book seems to present Judaism as a mystery religion, in which the Passover could be seen as a secret offering, and the crossing of the Red Sea as a new birth (Schwenk-Bressler, *Sapientia Salomonis*). Even if that is reading too much into the text, the author has constructed an erudite exposition of Jewish theology in philosophical terms. It is built around the narrative of the Passover and therefore might have been recited during the festival period.

VII. Reception History

There is no evidence of the Jewish reception of Wisdom (noted even by Jerome, *Preface to Wisdom*), although its acceptance by Christians and its possible influence on the New Testament indicate it had some circulation (so McGlynn, *Divine*, pp. 235–36). There are no citations of Wisdom in the New Testament, but some passages portray awareness of similar ideas if not the actual text. It is common to cite 2 Cor. 5.1–10 as drawing upon the language of Wis. 9.15, and Rom. 1.19–23 on the human condition arising from lack of knowledge of God might also draw on this. It is difficult to be certain when both works could be using shared traditions. The first possible reference is from the end of the first century in Clement (*Cor.* 27, alluding to Wis. 11.21; 12.12; Winston, *Wisdom*, p. 66; Larcher, *Sagesse*, p. 37), although it is possible that the author is drawing upon LXX Job 9.12. Wisdom was important too for Melito, who again does not cite the book explicitly but utilises its Exodus narrative for his Paschal Homily (e.g., Wis. 18.7 in *Pas. Hom.* 34; McGlynn, *Divine*, p. 238).

Not all reception of Wisdom was positive in the early Church, but it clearly took a hold for it to be included in the canon (for more on the reception see Winston, *Wisdom*, pp. 66–69; McGlynn, *Divine*, pp. 237–45). Its inclusion in the early Greek codices is indicative of this, but the earliest incorporation into a canon list is in the Muratorian canon. Deriving from a catalogue ca. 200 written in Greek but preserved in Latin, the book is said to have been written by the friends of Solomon. This obscure reference could have been a corruption of the name Philo (Greek φίλος ‘friend’) but could also be alluding to the role of friends in the book of Proverbs or even seeing some of the friends referred to there as the actual authors (see Horbury, ‘Muratorian’).

Bibliography

- Aitken, J.K., 'The Jewish Use of Septuagint Proverbs', in N. de Lange, J.G. Krivoruchko and C. Boyd-Taylor (eds.), *Jewish Reception of Greek Bible Versions: Studies in Their Use in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), pp. 53–77.
- No Stone Unturned: Greek Inscriptions and Septuagint Vocabulary* (CSHB; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2014).
- Cheon, S., *The Exodus Story in the Wisdom of Solomon: A Study in Biblical Interpretation* (JSPSup 23; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997).
- 'Anonymity in the Wisdom of Solomon', *JSP* 18 (1998), pp. 111–19.
- Clarke, E.G., *The Wisdom of Solomon* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973).
- Engberg-Pedersen, T., *Cosmology and Self in the Apostle Paul: The Material Spirit* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010).
- Enns, P.E., 'Pseudo-Solomon and His Scripture: Biblical Interpretation in the Wisdom of Solomon', in M. Henze (ed.), *A Companion to Biblical Interpretation in Early Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012), pp. 389–412.
- Grabbe, L.L., *Wisdom of Solomon* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997).
- Hengel, M., *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period* (2 vols.; London: SCM, 1974).
- Horbury, W., 'The Wisdom of Solomon in the Muratorian Fragment', *JTS* 45 (1994), pp. 149–59.
- 'The Christian Use and the Jewish Origins of the Wisdom of Solomon', in J. Day, R.P. Gordon, and H.G.M. Williamson (eds.), *Wisdom in Ancient Israel* (Festschrift J.A. Emerton; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1995), pp. 182–96.
- Larcher, C., *Le livre de la sagesse, ou, La sagesse de Salomon* (3 vols.; Paris: J. Gabalda, 1983–85).
- Léonas, A., 'The Poetics of Wisdom: Language and Style in the Wisdom of Solomon', in E. Bons and T.J. Kraus (eds.), *Et sapienter et eloquenter: Studies on Rhetorical and Stylistic Features of the Septuagint* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), pp. 99–126.
- McGlynn, M., *Divine Judgement and Divine Benevolence in the Book of Wisdom* (WUNT 2.139; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001).
- Reese, J.M., *Hellenistic Influence on the Book of Wisdom and Its Consequences* (Rome: Biblical Institute, 1970).
- Reymond, E.D., 'The Poetry of the Wisdom of Solomon Reconsidered', *VT* 52 (2002), pp. 385–99.
- Scarpato, G., *Libro della Sapienza: testo, traduzione, introduzione e commento a cura di Giuseppe* (3 vols.; Brescia: Paideia, 1989–99).
- Schwenk-Bressler, U., *Sapientia Salomonis als ein Beispiel frühjüdischer Textauslegung: die Auslegung des Buches Genesis, Exodus 1–15 und Teilen der Wüstentradition in Sap 10–19* (Frankfurt am Main: P. Lang, 1993).
- Winston, D., *Wisdom of Solomon: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 43; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1979).
- Ziegler, J. (ed.), *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum*. Vol. XII.1, *Sapientia Salomonis* (2nd ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980 [1962]).

Sirach (Ecclesiasticus)

Benjamin G. Wright

Editions

(a) Standard Greek Editions

Göttingen, vol. XII.2, *Sapientia Iesu filii Sirach* (Ziegler, 1980; 2nd ed.).¹

Rahlfs-Hanhart, vol. II, pp. 377–470.

Swete, vol. II, pp. 644–753.

(b) Other Editions

Hebrew: *The Book of Ben Sira* (Beentjes, 2003) and *The Book of Ben Sira* (Jerusalem, 1973).

Old Latin: *Biblia Sacra* (1964) and *Biblia sacra iuxta vulgatam versionem* (Weber, 1975).

Syriac: *La Sabiduría del Escriba* (Calduch-Benages *et al.*, 2003).

(c) Modern Translations

NETS (Wright, 2007), pp. 715–62.

LXX.D (Becker *et al.*, 2009), pp. 1090–1163.

La Biblia Griega, vol. III (Fernández Marcos *et al.*, 2013), pp. 547–670.

I. General Characteristics

The book of Ben Sira (Sirach, or Ecclesiasticus) is perhaps the most complicated in the LXX corpus, primarily owing to the problematic nature of the Hebrew texts. For most translated books (as opposed to works like Wisdom of Solomon, which are original Greek) there are

1. Owing to a displacement of chapters and verses in all Greek manuscripts, the Göttingen edition and NETS use the correct order with the displaced order in parentheses (see § V). This practice is followed here.

either complete Hebrew texts (mostly the MT, of course) with which to compare the Greek translation or no Hebrew text at all (e.g., 1 Maccabees). Hebrew exists for approximately two-thirds of Ben Sira, extant in six medieval manuscripts (labeled A–F) from the Cairo Genizah, portions of chs. 39–44 in the Masada scroll, a few partial lines in 2Q18 and parts of ch. 51 in 11QPs^a from Qumran. Although multiple Hebrew manuscripts exist for some passages, more often than not only one manuscript survives, or frequently no Hebrew at all is extant. Scholars generally agree that the extant Hebrew manuscripts reflect Ben Sira's Hebrew *in their essentials*, but they contain a plethora of corruptions and text-critical problems.

Unlike other books in the LXX corpus, scholars are fortunate that the translator of Ben Sira left a prologue to his work. In it he identifies himself as the author's grandson, and he reflects on the work of translating. Yet the character of the Greek of the prologue is almost as important as its content for thinking about the translation of Ben Sira, since in the prologue the grandson demonstrates an ability to write good Koine Greek. Skehan and Di Lella offer this assessment: 'Ben Sira's grandson wrote the prologue in carefully crafted prose, employing the grammar and syntax of literary Koine Greek; he must have had a first-rate education in the rhetoric and literature of the period' (*Wisdom*, p. 132).

Apparently, though, the grandson did not think that quality Koine was possible in a translation, since, although capable of writing good Greek, he produces a recognisable translationese, resulting from a translation approach that is largely isomorphic, that is, executed at the Hebrew word level rather than at the clause, sentence or discourse levels. At its best, the translation displays a non-literary register of Greek, but often it is unidiomatic (sometimes even difficult and awkward), even if it does not descend very often into nonsense (although that does happen on occasion; see §§ III and IV). In the prologue, the grandson requests of his reader some forbearance,

for what was originally expressed in Hebrew does not have the same force when it is in fact rendered in another language. And not only in this case, but also in the case of the Law itself and the Prophets and the rest of the books the difference is not small when these are expressed in their own language. (NETS)

Given the evidence of the prologue, the grandson was probably not an experienced translator and might well have developed his method of translation by using a similar approach to what he observed in translations of the ‘Law and the Prophets and the rest of the books’, which he claims to know. (For a discussion of what the grandson says in the prologue about translation, see Wright, ‘Why a Prologue?’. For a different view, see De Crom, ‘Translation Equivalence’.) At any rate, the quality of the Greek in the translation is significantly inferior to what the grandson writes in the prologue.

To say that a translation is isomorphic, however, is not to say that it is necessarily wooden, slavish or mechanical—and Sirach is often none of these. The translator displays periodic sensitivity to the Hebrew, and his transparent concern is to relay what he thought the Hebrew meant within his isomorphic method of translation (§ IV). Indeed, Aitken has shown that the translator could employ literary vocabulary and Greek rhetorical forms in his translation, thus betraying the kind of ability in Greek of the sort that can be observed in his prologue (‘Literary Attainment’).

II. Time and Place of Composition

For the translation of Sirach, scholars possess some touchstones for a date. The book preserves the name of the original author—Jesus son of Eleazar son of Sirach (50.27). From various pieces of internal evidence, most prominently the author’s mention of the high priest Simon II (219–196 B.C.E.) and his silence on anything to do with the Hasmonean Revolt, scholars usually situate the original Hebrew composition sometime between 195 B.C.E. and 180 B.C.E. Calculating two generations from grandfather to grandson, we arrive at the latter third of the second century B.C.E. for the translation. The grandson’s prologue provides several pieces of information that enable us to be more precise and that confirm this conclusion. He writes in the prologue, ‘For in the thirty-eighth year, in the reign of Euergetes the king, when I had arrived in Egypt...’ (NETS). Two Ptolemies bore the title ‘Euergetes’, Ptolemy III (reigned 246–221 B.C.E.) and Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II Physcon (also designated Ptolemy VII, reigned 170–164, 146–117 B.C.E.). The earlier

Ptolemy only reigned for twenty-five years, and so the Euergetes mentioned by the grandson must be Ptolemy VIII. Taking the accession date of 170 and counting thirty-eight years brings us to 132 B.C.E. for the time that the grandson arrived in Egypt. The grandson further notes that after he had ‘stayed a while’ (συγχρονίσας) he discovered ‘an exemplar of no little education’. The participle *συγχρονίσας* can have the sense of ‘to be contemporaneous with’, and some scholars have taken this to indicate that the grandson was in Egypt through the end of Euergetes’ reign. Thus, one can arrive at an approximate date of slightly before or after 117 B.C.E. for the grandson’s translation.

With respect to place, the grandson explicitly states that he made the translation in Egypt, but he gives no additional details as to where. The most likely locale would be Alexandria, where such scholarly activity might be readily undertaken.

III. Language

When the extant Hebrew is set over against the Greek, one sees clearly that the grandson employed an isomorphic approach to translating. The result is a Greek text that mirrors many aspects of the grammar and syntax of its source. So, for example, structure words, such as prepositions, are often used in non-Greek ways, as in 7.19 where the translator renders the Hebrew comparative *מִן* by the Greek preposition *ὑπέρ*, which does not have that function in Greek. Or certain idiomatic phrases in Hebrew become essentially meaningless in the Greek, as in Sir. 32(35).12 where the Hebrew idiom *עִן בְּטוֹב*, ‘with generosity’, is translated literally as *ἐν ἀγαθῷ ὀφθαλμῷ*, ‘with a good eye’, a phrase that, although it might carry some meaning, does not have the same idiomatic sense as the Hebrew, leaving a Greek reader mostly in the dark as to the intended meaning of the verse. Anyone who could not compare the translation with the original would be able to make sense out of most of the translation, but he/she would find it difficult. The Greek of Sirach never rises to the level of decent Koine (definitely not to that of the prologue), let alone literary Greek.

IV. Translation and Composition

There has been relatively little systematic study of specific translation techniques in Sirach. The one major study devoted to this issue is my own *No Small Difference*, in which several aspects of the Greek translation are examined—word order, segmentation of Hebrew words, quantitative representation, lexical representation—together with the influence of the LXX on the Greek of Sirach (for a valuable study of one short section, see Reiterer, ‘*Urtext*’ und *Übersetzungen*). One of the goals of Wright’s study was to determine the extent to which the Greek translation might allow reasonable reconstructions of Ben Sira’s Hebrew in places where it was not extant. The conclusion that the Greek alone ‘would not seem to provide a firm basis for reconstructions’ remains true as a generalisation (Wright, *No Small Difference*, p. 115), but the issues could now be expressed somewhat differently.

Within the larger context of the LXX corpus and with very few exceptions, the primary approach to translation is on the word or morpheme level, called above ‘isomorphic’. At times translators might be cognisant of the clause or discourse levels, but any close study of these translations reveals their basic isomorphism. Thus, in most cases, and certainly in Sirach, one finds a spectrum of approaches to individual aspects of translation technique, but each is constrained by this overall isomorphic approach. For example, if we look at how closely various books of the LXX corpus adhere to Hebrew word order, the translation of Song of Songs hardly departs at all from it. Sirach only departs from Hebrew word order approximately 3% of the time. Translations like Proverbs or Job are more in the 10% range (*No Small Difference*, p. 49). Even the most deviant translations, then, adhere to Hebrew word order about 90% of the time (on isomorphism see Pietersma, ‘New Paradigm’; Boyd-Taylor, *Reading*).

This approach almost inevitably results in relatively high levels of positive and negative interference. Positive interference is characterised by a distribution of target language features at odds with the conventional distribution of those features in the language. Negative interference occurs when the formal features of the source language govern the translator’s selection of target language features to the extent that the

translation results in an ill-formed text by the standards of the target language (see Toury, *Descriptive*, pp. 274–79). All translations exhibit both types of interference, but isomorphic approaches not surprisingly yield more negative interference. Thus, for the LXX corpus, including a book like Sirach, we should not *expect* to find good Koine Greek.

One example of positive interference seen throughout the LXX corpus, including Sirach, is the overwhelming number of occurrences of the Greek conjunction *καί*, which usually serves as the default rendering for Hebrew *ו*, in contrast to the infrequent use of second position particles such as *μέν* or *δέ* (see below). A Greek text in which most clauses are connected with *καί* is not ungrammatical or nonsensical, and a Greek reader can understand it. Yet, the author of a well-formed Greek text will pay more attention to the logical relationship of clauses, and consequently the number of clauses beginning with *καί* compared to those with second position conjunctions will be much smaller than in the LXX. Thus, the distribution of *καί* as a clause coordinator is much higher in the LXX than in standard Greek composition.

Negative interference often creates a translation much more difficult to understand, even if standard Greek conventions are not violated. One such type of interference is syntactical. To illustrate, in 14.17 the Hebrew ends with an infinitive absolute construction (adding emphasis to the verb), *גוע יגועו* ‘they shall surely die’. The Greek retains something of the Hebrew construction, resulting in *θανάτω ἀποθανῆ* (with a change in person) ‘by death you shall die’, a decidedly un-Greek phrase. Another sort of negative interference involves idiomatic expressions, as in 4.22a, where the Greek *μὴ λάβῃς πρόσωπον κατὰ τῆς ψυχῆς σου* renders the Hebrew *אל תשא פניך על נפשך* ‘Do not show partiality to your own harm’ (NRSV; lit. ‘against yourself’). The translator, working at the word level, has chosen the default equivalence of *πρόσωπον* for the Hebrew ‘face’, resulting in a non-idiomatic Greek phrase that does not convey the Hebrew idiom ‘to show partiality’. Second, Hebrew uses the noun *נפש* plus a possessive pronoun to indicate a reflexive, in this case ‘yourself’. Greek has its own set of reflexive pronouns, and the grandson does use one in 37.8c. In 4.22a, however, he resorts to his default rendering of *ψυχῆ* for *נפש*, resulting in a phrase that is not reflexive in Greek. What would a Greek reader think of such a sentence that reads something like

‘Do not receive a person against your soul’ (NETS)? Grammatical and intelligible, but not well-formed. Examples of both positive and negative interference abound in Sirach. Set within this larger framework into which most LXX translations fit, we can comment on several aspects of translation technique in Sirach, always bearing in mind the complex state of the Hebrew text of the book.

a. Word Order

Ben Sira’s grandson follows the word order of his Hebrew parent text (Wright, *No Small Difference*, pp. 35–54). Yet, word order differences are not all the same, since some involve syntactic differences and some displacement variations. For example, in Hebrew the possessive pronoun always follows the noun it governs or the conjunction ו always attaches to the beginning of a word and, thus, are inviolable orders. Greek, for its part, is more flexible and can have a possessive precede the noun it governs. A translator who wants to maintain the Hebrew word order will thus have the possessive following its noun or will use a conjunction like καί rather than a post-position conjunction such as δέ. Displacement differences, such as the reversal of two nouns in a series, do not originate out of syntactical concerns, since such orders are not fixed in Hebrew.

In Sirach we see both kinds of variation in word order. Syntactical variations are frequent. There are almost 50 uses of the post-position conjunction δέ and over 120 occurrences of the post-position conjunction γάρ. Although in a number of cases, such as 3.9 (γάρ), it looks as if the translator has added the conjunction to create a clear logical connection between clauses (since there is no Hebrew counterpart), in the majority of occurrences δέ translates ו and γάρ renders כִּי, creating a difference in word order. With respect to the use of pronouns, we find in 8.2 מַחֲרִימֶנִּי (MS A), which the translator renders σου τὴν ὀλκὴν, with the possessive pronoun preceding the noun (acceptable in Greek), violating the Hebrew word order. The same kind of variation happens with object pronouns. The Hebrew תִּשְׁמַחֲנִי in 13.9 comes into Greek as σε προσκαλέσεται, an order impossible in Hebrew but acceptable in Greek. All these cases indicate the translator’s occasional preference for Greek style over adherence to Hebrew word order, even within an isomorphic approach.

In Sirach, we encounter several different kinds of displacement differences, distinguished for the most part by the unit of displacement—word, phrase or clause. In some cases the reason for the displacement is clear; in others it is very difficult to judge whether a displacement originated with the translator or was already present in the *Vorlage*. Sirach 34(31).9b illustrates displacement at the word level for which the reason seems transparent. The Hebrew phrase **כִּי הַפְּלִיא לַעֲשׂוֹת** combines a finite verb with an infinitive, meaning something like ‘for working wonders by doing’. The translator seems to have had difficulty with the phrase, and as a result he transformed it into a verb with direct object, *ἐποίησεν γὰρ θαυμάσια* ‘for he did wonders’, reversing the Hebrew morphemes. The reason for the displacement at the end of 35(32).8(12) is not as transparent, however. The Hebrew phrase **וּמַחֲרִישׁ יַחַד** is rendered into Greek as *καὶ ἄμα σιωπῶν* ‘and at the same time being silent’. Even though the translator has the correct sense of the Hebrew, he diverges from the Hebrew text by placing the adverb before the participle, even though in Greek it could go after the verb in agreement with the Hebrew (see also Voitila, ‘Differences’).

b. Quantitative Representation

In isomorphic translations one notable feature is the extent to which the translator maintains quantitative parity with the source text—each element in the source with a corresponding element in the translation. In the LXX corpus, we encounter two different types of quantitative representation. Segmentation indicates the extent to which LXX translators divide Hebrew morphemes into their constituent elements. So, for example, 41.19 begins with **וּמַמְקוֹם** (MS B) rendered into Greek as *καὶ ἀπὸ τόπου*. The translator has segmented the Hebrew word into its various parts—conjunction, preposition and noun—and represented each. The second kind of quantitative representation—on the levels of morpheme, phrase, clause or sentence—concerns the extent to which translators add or subtract elements from their source text. A simple example comes from 43.5, where the Hebrew of the verse beginning **כִּי גְדוֹל אֲדֹנָי** (Masada)² is rendered *μέγας κύριος*. He does not represent the initial

2. MSS B, B(mg) and Masada all have the conjunction. Variation appears in the writing of the divine name.

conjunction of the Hebrew. At 43.19a for which MS B and Masada have *וּגַם כִּפּוֹר כַּמֶּלַח יִשְׁפֹךְ*, ‘and he pours out frost like salt’, the Greek translator renders the clause *καὶ πάχνην ὡς ἄλα ἐπὶ γῆς χέει* ‘and frost, like salt, he pours upon the earth’ (NETS). The translator has added ‘upon the earth’, which offers more detail than the Hebrew, even though there is no warrant for it (see Wright, *No Small Difference*, pp. 67–91).

Ben Sira’s grandson is willing to depart from a strict one-to-one representation of the Hebrew source text. In statistical comparisons with other books in the LXX corpus, the translation falls within a narrow range of deviation for quantitatively longer renderings in those places where the Hebrew is extant. The translation more frequently departs from one-to-one segmentation of the Hebrew, however, and it contains a greater percentage of shorter translations. This complicates attempts at quantitative reconstructions of the Hebrew of Ben Sira based on the Greek. Thus if only the Greek text was extant at 43.19, we would be tempted to reconstruct the Hebrew phrase with the addition of *לָאֶרֶץ*. Yet, given its absence from MS B and Masada, the likelihood is that this is an addition in Greek.

c. Lexical Consistency

Lexical consistency—the tendency to establish default Hebrew-Greek renderings—can be observed throughout the LXX corpus. Naturally the use of defaults by translators sometimes produces very odd results. Within an isomorphic translation, however, a translator might at the same time demonstrate some sensitivity to the nuances of meaning in Hebrew words. Such is the case with Sirach. Although content words, such as nouns and verbs, illustrate this phenomenon best, translators establish default equivalents for the entire array of parts of speech in the source language (see Wright, *No Small Difference*, pp. 91–112; on lexical consistency, Wade, ‘Evaluating’). In Sirach as in most LXX translations, one specific part of speech is usually translated by the same part of speech, preposition for preposition, verb for verb, noun for noun. Often the resulting translation might not read well. In 46.6, for example, where the Hebrew has the idiomatic *מִלֵּא אַחֲרַי אֵל*, meaning ‘to follow someone completely’, the grandson seems to understand the meaning: *ἐπηκολούθησεν ὀπίσω δυνάστου* ‘he followed after a powerful one’. The use of *ὀπίσω* representing *אַחֲרַי*, however, creates a pleonasm in Greek,

since the verb ἐπακολουθέω ‘to follow after’, does not require the preposition but only the dative case in standard Greek. One encounters many such odd uses of structure words in Sirach which reinforce both the isomorphism of the translation approach and the translationese character of the Greek.

Overall for content words, like nouns and verbs, the grandson does not exhibit high levels of lexical consistency compared to other books in the LXX corpus, some of which are characterised by almost 100% consistency (e.g., Ecclesiastes; for comparative charts, see Wright, *No Small Difference*, pp. 106–108). One thus finds in Sirach a fair amount of semantic leveling (different Hebrew words with different semantic ranges being translated by the same Greek word, thus eliminating some semantic distinction from the Hebrew) and semantic differentiation (one Hebrew word being rendered by several different Greek words, thus introducing semantic distinctions in Greek). One example of each will illustrate the case. The noun ἀγαλλίαμα ‘joy, exultation’ in four occurrences with extant Hebrew renders three different Hebrew words: שמחה, תפארת and גיל. Conversely, the Hebrew verb מנע, ‘withhold, hold back’, has eight different equivalents in Greek: ἀντιλαμβάνω, ἀποκωλύω, ἀφυστερέρω, ἐμποδίζω, κωλύω, παρέλκω, στερέω and συνέχω (NETS, pp. 716–17).

d. Influence of other Jewish-Greek Translations

In his prologue Ben Sira’s grandson refers three times to ‘the Law, the Prophets and the other ancestral books’, once referring to them in the context of his own translation activity. While these three categories should not be seen as intending a tripartite scriptural corpus, the grandson certainly knows other Jewish-Greek translations. Smend expresses a common sentiment: ‘Without doubt he [the grandson] was capable of comparing the LXX with the Hebrew text, for the Pentateuch and the historical books, working very carefully throughout; it often served him as a dictionary’ (*Die Weisheit*, p. lxiii). Yet, careful examination of the grandson’s translation in places where Ben Sira’s Hebrew reflects influence from Hebrew scriptural texts reveals very little dependence on the LXX books on the part of the translator. Moreover, when one looks at the grandson’s renderings of specific Hebrew terms, quite a different picture emerges from the one painted by Smend (see Wright, *No Small*

Difference, ch. 3). Even some terms that have become calques (Greek words that have taken Hebrew meanings) in the LXX (and thus by the time of Ben Sira's grandson) are not treated as such in Sirach. The best example is one that early on became a calque, the use of διαθήκη for ברית to mean 'covenant'. The grandson indeed employs this translation equivalence, but he also uniquely uses the Greek word to render קק in both technical and non-technical contexts (e.g., 11.20; see NETS, pp. 717–18; Wright, *No Small Difference*, pp. 178–81).

V. Key Text-Critical Issues

The text-critical situation in Ben Sira is tremendously complex, and anyone working with the book must work with the Hebrew, Greek, Old Latin and Syriac versions. The Hebrew was transmitted in two forms, HTI and HTII (an expanded recension or recensions). The Greek also has two recensions, GI and GII. For the most part, the expanded GII recension is extant in Joseph Ziegler's *O* and *L'* (which includes the famous Codex 248) manuscript groups, but no single Greek manuscript contains all of the GII additions, only a selection. Whoever translated the expanded GII material did not make a new translation of the entire book, but rather used GI as a base and translated GII where no Greek existed. In his critical edition, Ziegler also notes that of all the books in the LXX corpus, Sirach has perhaps suffered the most during its transmission history. As a result, he has resorted to a relatively large number of emendations and conjectures to resolve the obvious difficulties in the Greek text (see Ziegler, Göttingen, pp. 73–76).

Finally every Greek manuscript of Sirach preserves a textual displacement in which 30.25–33.13a has been transposed with 33.13b–36.16a. Increasingly most citations of these chapters in Sirach use the correct chapter/verse order.

VI. Ideology and Exegesis

Before discussing the extent to which exegesis is present in Sirach, we must have a firm grasp of what we are talking about. First, we must be intentional about examining the text as produced—what the *translator* did with his source text—not the way that subsequent readers understood

the text in its reception history. Second, since the translation is executed at the level of the individual morpheme, we need to begin at the same level to identify any potential exegesis. Thus, the search for exegesis in Sirach depends initially on a description of the textual-linguistic makeup of the translated text (Pietersma, 'Exegesis'). In the case of Sirach, one does not encounter *ideology*, if by that we mean some systematic interpretation of the Hebrew text engaged in at the discourse level (or what might alternatively be called theology). In addition, we do not encounter a lot of *exegesis*, which requires that the translator act 'deliberately, systematically, and purposefully' (Pietersma, 'Exegesis', p. 35). We do, however, encounter quite a few places where the translator has interpreted his source text as a result of trying to make sense out of the Hebrew within a primarily word-based translation approach. Minissale (*La versione*) even sees the translator engaging in 'midrashic' or 'targumic' interpretation.

Two examples should make the distinction between interpretation of the source text and exegesis clear. In 49.2 Ben Sira praises King Josiah 'for he was grieved/sickened at our apostasies (משובתינו)'. The corresponding Greek reads, *αὐτὸς κατευθύνθη ἐν ἐπιστροφῇ λαοῦ* 'he prospered in turning around the people'. Despite the difference between the Hebrew and the Greek, it does not appear that the grandson was deliberately shifting the focus from apostasy to repentance. That shift comes as a result of his reading of his Hebrew *Vorlage*. The key is the way that the grandson understood משובתינו. Instead of reading the noun משובה, 'backsliding, apostasy', he identified the root as coming from שוב 'turn, turn around, repent', which determined his understanding of the entire clause. As a result he had to ignore the meaning of the main verb. It just so happens that the Greek makes good sense in the context of praising Josiah, but the translation resulted from making sense out of the Hebrew, not from a conscious decision to reframe or to transform it. One encounters many such passages in Sirach.

Sirach 44.20, part of Ben Sira's praise of Abraham, exemplifies the difficulty of identifying exegesis at the production stage of translation, and it involves the *διαθήκη* / חק equivalence. Both MS B and Masada read 'and he [God] entered into a covenant (ברית) with him; in his flesh he made for him a statute (חק)'. Ben Sira distinguishes between the covenant of circumcision and the statute given to Abraham, which most

likely refers to the command to circumcise all of his descendants. The translator, however, levels the semantic difference by using *διαθήκη* in both places: ‘and he entered in a covenant (*διαθήκη*) with him; in his flesh he established a covenant (*διαθήκη*)’. The translation has the effect of broadening the focus from a specific commandment to the more general idea of a covenantal relationship presumably with all of Israel. Yet, the effect of the translation on its own is not enough to indicate a translator’s exegesis. We also want to know how the grandson handles *קח* elsewhere, and in some places he recognises that *קח* cannot mean ‘covenant’. In 41.2-3, for example, where Ben Sira speaks twice of death’s ‘decree’ (*קח*), the grandson displays contextual sensitivity and employs the noun *κρίμα* ‘judgement’. But within the Praise of the Ancestors section (chs. 44–50), the grandson renders *קח* by *διαθήκη* consistently, which suggests that he intentionally moves from specific statutes to divine covenants (cf. 44.20; 45.5, 7, 17, 24; 47.11) in order to characterise the relationship between these ancestors, Israel and God.

VII. Reception History

The Hebrew of Ben Sira was not included in the Jewish biblical canon. Testimony to its survival, however, is found in the numerous quotations of the book in rabbinic literature. Of course, the medieval manuscripts discovered in the Cairo Genizah constitute *prima facie* evidence for its continued existence in Hebrew.

The Greek translation seems to have been influential in early Christianity, and it eventually was included in the Christian Old Testament (only to be excised by Protestants in the sixteenth century). Sirach is not cited explicitly in the New Testament, and scholars differ as to how much influence it had on the New Testament writings. Those who see broad influence have argued for it primarily in Matthew, Luke, some of Paul’s letters and the Epistle of James (cf. Harrington, *Invitation*, p. 90; Schürer, *History*, vol. III.1, pp. 205–208).

In other early Christian literature, *Did.* 4.5 and *Barn.* 19.9 bear a very close resemblance to, and perhaps are taken from, Sir. 4.31. If these texts do depend on Sirach, they would be the earliest examples of direct Christian use of the book. A healthy number of Greek and Latin church

fathers, including Clement of Alexandria, Origen, John Chrysostom, Tertullian, Jerome and Augustine, use Sirach in their writings, and as early as Clement of Alexandria Sirach is cited as scripture, demonstrating the high regard the book came to have in Christian tradition.

Bibliography

- Aitken, J.K., 'The Literary Attainment of the Translator of Greek Sirach', in J.-S. Rey and J. Joosten (eds.), *The Texts and Versions of the Book of Ben Sira: Transmission and Interpretation* (JSJSup 150; Leiden: Brill, 2011), pp. 95–126.
- Beentjes, P.C., *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew: A Text Edition of all Extant Manuscripts and a Synopsis of all Parallel Hebrew Ben Sira Texts* (VTSup 68; Leiden: Brill, 2003).
- Biblia Sacra iuxta latinam vulgatam versionem, 12: Sapientia Salomonis, Liber Hiesu filii Sirach* (Rome: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1964).
- The Book of Ben Sira: Text, Concordance and an Analysis of the Vocabulary* (Hebrew) (Jerusalem: The Academy of the Hebrew Language and the Shrine of the Book, 1973).
- Boyd-Taylor, C., *Reading between the Lines: The Interlinear Paradigm for Septuagint Studies* (Biblical Tools and Studies 8; Leuven: Peeters, 2011).
- Cadbury, H.J., 'The Grandson of Ben Sira', *HTR* 46 (1955), pp. 219–25.
- Calduch-Benages, N., J. Ferrer and J. Liesen, *La Sabiduría del Escriba/Wisdom of the Scribe. Diplomatic Edition of the Syriac Version of the Book of Ben Sira according to Codex Ambrosianus, with Translations in Spanish and English* (Estella [Navarra], Spain: Editorial Verbo Divino, 2003).
- De Crom, D., 'Translation Equivalence in the Prologue to Greek Ben Sirach', in M. Peters (ed.), *XIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Ljubljana, 2007* (SBLSCS 55; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007), pp. 99–111.
- Harrington, D., *Invitation to the Apocrypha* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999).
- Kearns, C., *The Expanded Text of Ecclesiasticus: Its Teaching on the Future Life as a Clue to Its Origin* (ed. P.C. Beentjes; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011) [originally S.S.D. dissertation, The Pontifical Biblical Commission, Rome, 1961].
- Minissale, A., 'A Descriptive Feature of the Greek Sirach: The Effect instead of the Cause', in B.A. Taylor (ed.), *IX Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Cambridge 1995* (SBLSCS 45; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), pp. 421–29.
- La versione greca del Siracide confronto con il testo ebraico alla luce dell'attività midrascica e del metodo targumico* (AnBib 133; Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1995).

The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint

- Pietersma, A., 'Exegesis in the Septuagint: Possibilities and Limits (The Psalter as a Case in Point)', in W. Kraus and R.G. Wooden (eds.), *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Jewish Greek Scriptures* (SBLSCS 53; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), pp. 33–45.
- 'A New Paradigm for Addressing Old Questions: The Relevance of the Interlinear Model for the Study of the Septuagint', in J. Cook (ed.), *Bible and Computer: The Stellenbosch AIBI Conference. Proceedings of the Association Internationale Bible et Informatique, 'From Alph to Byte'*, University of Stellenbosch 17–21 July, 2000 (Leiden: Brill, 2002), pp. 337–64.
- Reiterer, F.V., 'Urtext' und Übersetzungen. *Sprachstudie über Sir 44,16–45,26 als Beitrag zur Siraforschung* (ATAT 12; St. Ottilien: EOS, 1980).
- Rey, J.-S., and J. Joosten, *The Texts and Versions of the Book of Ben Sira: Transmission and Interpretation* (JSJS 150; Leiden: Brill, 2011).
- Segal, M., ספר בן סירא השלם (Jerusalem: Bialik Foundation, 1958).
- Skehan, P.W., and A.A. Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira* (AB 39; New York: Doubleday, 1987).
- Smend, R., *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach erklärt* (Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1906).
- Thiele, W., *Vetus Latina: Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel*. Vol. XI/2, *Sirach (Ecclesiasticus)* (Freiburg: Herder, 1987–2005).
- Toury, G., *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond* (John Benjamins Library 4; Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1995).
- Voitila, A., 'Differences in Sentences, Lines, and Verses in the Hebrew and Greek Texts of Ben Sira', *BIOSCS* 41 (2008), pp. 76–83.
- Wade, M., 'Evaluating Lexical Consistency in the Old Greek Bible', *BIOSCS* 33 (2000), pp. 53–75.
- Weber, R., *Biblia sacra iuxta vulgatam versionem*, vol. II (2 vols.; 2nd ed. rev.; Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1975), pp. 1029–95.
- Wright, B.G., *No Small Difference: Sirach's Relationship to Its Hebrew Parent Text* (SBLSCS 26; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989).
- '“To the Reader of Sirach” and English Translation of Sirach', in A. Pietersma and B.G. Wright (eds.), *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), pp. 715–62.
- 'Why a Prologue? Ben Sira's Grandson and His Greek Translation', in S.M. Paul *et al.* (eds.), *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls* (Festschrift E. Tov; VTSup 94; Leiden: Brill, 2003), pp. 633–44.
- Ziegler, J. (ed.), *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum*. Vol. XII.2, *Sapientia Iesu filii Sirach* (2nd ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980 [1965]).

Psalms of Solomon

Daniele Pevarello

Editions

(a) Standard Greek Editions

Göttingen (none available at present).
Rahlfs-Hanhart, vol. II, pp. 471–89.
Swete, vol. III, pp. 765–87.

(b) Other Greek Editions

The Psalms of Solomon (Wright, 2007).
The Psalms of Solomon (Swete, 1899).
ΨΑΛΜΟΙ ΣΟΛΟΜΩΝΤΟΣ (Gebhardt, 1895).
Libri Apocryphi Veteri Testamenti graece (Fritzsche, 1871).
Die Psalter Salomo's (Geiger, 1871).

(c) Modern Translations

NETS (Atkinson, 2007), pp. 763–76.¹
LXX.D (Scholtissek and Steins, 2009), pp. 915–32.
La Biblia Griega, vol. III (Fernández Marcos *et al.*, 2013), pp. 239–70.

I. General Characteristics

The book of the *Psalms of Solomon* is a collection of 18 Greek hymns which have been handed down under the name of Solomon. The attribution to Solomon may have been influenced by the resemblance between

1. See also the English translation *ΨΑΛΜΟΙ ΣΟΛΟΜΩΝΤΟΣ* (Ryle and Montague, 1891).

Pss. Sol. 17 and the canonical Psalm 72 (Wright, *Psalms*, p. 7) or by the information provided in 1 Kgs 5.12, where Solomon is said to have authored three thousand proverbs and five thousand songs (in the LXX), or a thousand and five (in the MT). In most Greek manuscripts, the *Psalms* were copied alongside other books traditionally linked with Solomon such as Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Wisdom and other Wisdom literature, like Job and Sirach. In a few cases, copyists have given priority to the hymnic character of the collection, coupling the *Psalms of Solomon* with selections of hymns from the Old and New Testament or commentaries and *catenae* on the canonical Psalms. This is the case in MS 769 from the monastery of Great Lavra, now at the Benaki Museum in Athens, where the *Psalms of Solomon* appear alongside the Greek *Book of Odes*. In their account of the manuscript tradition of the *Psalms*, Hann (*Manuscript*, p. 5) and Wright (*Psalms*, p. 24) seem to mistake the Christian *Book of Odes* with the *Odes of Solomon*. The link between *Psalms of Solomon* and the Syriac *Odes of Solomon*, however, is attested in the Syriac manuscript tradition, where some manuscripts contain the Syriac text of the *Psalms* immediately after the 42 *Odes of Solomon*, beginning *Pss. Sol.* 1 at number 43 without any interval.

II. Time and Place of Composition

References to foreign invaders in the *Psalms of Solomon* have been variously interpreted as referring to Antiochus Epiphanes, Herod the Great, Pompey, Titus and even Nebuchadnezzar II. Scholars seem to agree that Pompey would better explain most historical references in the book. The possibility that the *Psalms of Solomon* may refer to Titus or Nebuchadnezzar II is unlikely. Titus destroyed the Temple in the year 70 C.E., as did Nebuchadnezzar II in 586 B.C.E., while the *Psalms* do not seem to refer to the destruction of the Jerusalem temple. Antiochus, Herod or Pompey would be a better match for the invader described in the *Psalms of Solomon*. *Psalms of Solomon* 17.12 says that the enemy sent the children of Israel to the west, which cannot apply to Antiochus or Herod. Josephus recorded that Pompey, after the capture of Jerusalem, carried away Aristobulos and his children to Rome (*Ant.* 14.79), which would suggest that *Pss. Sol.* 17.12 may refer to an episode of Pompey's campaign. Another agreement between Josephus's account of Pompey's

campaign in Palestine (63 B.C.E.) and the *Psalms of Solomon* is found in *Pss. Sol.* 8.16-18. Here, the author observes that the Jewish rulers at first welcomed the enemy's coming and allowed them to enter the city walls in peace. In *Ant.* 14.34-36, Aristobulos sends ambassadors with gifts to Pompey. This welcoming attitude of the Jewish authorities towards the Romans agrees with that described in *Pss. Sol.* 8.16-18 and may reflect an historical event. Moreover, in *Ant.* 14.59, Pompey's army breaks into the city walls without fighting, while Aristobulos's partisans shut themselves into the Temple to prepare their resistance (*Ant.* 14.58). Another resemblance between Josephus' description of Pompey's campaign and the military campaign of the enemy in the *Psalms* can be seen in the use of siege engines. Scholars (Gray, 'Psalms', p. 631; Wright, 'Psalms', p. 641) point out that the reference to a battering-ram ($\chi\rho\iota\beta\acute{o}\varsigma$) against the walls of the Temple in *Pss. Sol.* 2.1-2 agrees with the information provided by Josephus that Pompey deployed siege engines in his final assault on the Temple (*Ant.* 14.62).

The most compelling case for the identification of the enemy with Pompey is the description of the enemy's death in *Pss. Sol.* 2.26-27. In the *Psalms*, the enemy is pierced to death in Egypt and his unburied body carried away by the waves. According to Plutarch, after his defeat at Pharsalus (48 B.C.E.), Pompey took refuge in Egypt (*Pompeius* 76). Betrayed by his companions, Pompey is stabbed to death on the shores of Egypt before the eyes of his horrified wife, who witnesses his death from a boat (*Pompeius* 79). Plutarch does not say that Pompey's corpse remained unburied, but that it was cremated in Egypt and the ashes buried in Alba (*Pompeius* 80). In the same passage, however, Plutarch reports that Pompey's assassins threw his decapitated corpse into the sea, agreeing with the narrative of *Pss. Sol.* 2.27. As Pompey is the only captor of Jerusalem who died in Egypt, the identification of the enemy of the *Psalms* with the Roman general seems reasonably likely.

Only a few psalms of the collection, however, seem to allude to historical events. Most of the *Psalms* are rather generic in content and cannot offer any clues as to dating. Some commentators (Wellhausen, *Die Pharisäer*; Atkinson, *I Cried to the Lord*) prefer to date individual psalms in the collection separately. Atkinson (*I Cried to the Lord*, pp. 89-127) identifies at least five *Psalms of Solomon* which may have been composed in a time prior to Pompey's siege. Even the dating of

individual psalms, however, remains problematic. *Psalms of Solomon* 7, for example, has been listed by Atkinson (*I Cried to the Lord*, p. 111) among the compositions preceding Pompey's time. Wellhausen (*Die Pharisäer*, p. 149), however, dated *Pss. Sol.* 7 to the time of Herod and precisely to Sosius's siege of Jerusalem (37 B.C.E.), claiming that the sense of imminent upheaval and the theocratic fanaticism of the composition do not reflect the historical situation before Pompey's siege. Commentators have also connected Herod and Sosius's siege of Jerusalem in 37 B.C.E. with *Pss. Sol.* 17, suggesting that the observation that the enemy is alien to the Jewish race (ἄνθρωπον ἀλλότριον γένους ἡμῶν) in *Pss. Sol.* 17.7 would agree with the political ambitions of the Idumaeen Herod and would be rather redundant if it referred to Pompey (Wright, *Psalms*, pp. 5–6).

The idea that the *Psalms* may have been written at different times has suggested to some commentators that the collection could have been written by more than one author. Wright (*Psalms*, p. 1), for example, observes that alongside more generic compositions, some psalms, in particular *Pss. Sol.* 1, 2, 8 and 17, seem to contain 'vivid, apparently eyewitness' accounts of the events. The claim that the more historical psalms were written by an eyewitness, however, should probably be considered with caution. The vividness of the descriptions does not imply the work of an eyewitness. Josephus, who was not an eyewitness of Pompey's siege, wrote equally vivid accounts of the event. Moreover, the author's frequent use of biblical allusions and imagery makes the identification of genuine historical references rather problematic. One example is the dramatic description of the sudden 'clamour of war' (κραυγὴ πολέμου) heard by the righteous at the opening of the collection in *Pss. Sol.* 1.2. Ryle and James (*ΨΑΛΜΟΙ*, p. 4) have interpreted this clamour as the sudden outbreak of civil war between Hyrcanus and Aristobulos on the death of Alexandra in 69 B.C.E. Viteau (*Psaumes*, p. 38) has seen here a reference to Pompey's campaign in 64–63 B.C.E., while Wellhausen (*Die Pharisäer*, pp. 139–40) has suggested the threat of the Seleucids at the beginning of the Maccabean revolt. The fact that the author describes the episode with a biblical expression (cf. κραυγὴν πολέμου in Jer. 4.19) does not permit precise identification of the events portrayed in *Pss. Sol.* 1.2. It is also possible that the final redaction of the *Psalms of Solomon* was completed several years after the events

described in the book. Atkinson (*I Cried to the Lord*, pp. 205–206) has proposed that *Pss. Sol.* 1 and 18 could be historical retrospectives placed at the beginning and at the end of the composition by a later redactor. Horbury has proposed a late date for the composition of the final form of the collection (‘Remembrance’, p. 119), drawing attention to the absence of the *Psalms of Solomon* from the discoveries at Qumran. Wright (*Psalms*, pp. 6–7) suggests that the attribution of the book to Solomon could reflect the perspective of a final redaction completed in Herodian times.

The place of composition is uncertain. Ryle and James (*ΨΑΛΜΟΙ*, p. lviii) argue that the *Psalms* were composed in Jerusalem, building on the ‘prominence’ of the city in the narrative. Wright (*Psalms*, p. 7) also speaks of the ‘unusual prominence’ of Jerusalem in the book. Although the interest of the author gravitates around the city and the Temple, these arguments are not particularly compelling. Observations on the prominent role of Jerusalem would be equally true of most of the books of the Old and New Testaments. Not all commentators, however, have indicated Jerusalem as place of composition. Hilgenfeld (*Messias*, p. 103), argues that the *Psalms* were composed in Alexandria in Greek and even identifies Alexandrian features in their language. Viteau (*Psaumes*, p. 140) indicated Alexandria as the place where the putative original Hebrew of the *Psalms* was translated into Greek.

III. Language

The Greek of the *Psalms of Solomon* has been variously assessed by commentators. Viteau argues that the *Psalms* were originally composed in Hebrew and then translated into Greek shortly before the destruction of the Temple (70 C.E.). He considers the Greek of the *Psalms* linguistically more advanced (‘avancée’) and mature (‘mûre’) than that of other books of the LXX (*Psaumes*, p. 141). Hilgenfeld (*Messias*, p. xvii) rejects Solomon’s authorship precisely on the basis of the excellence of the Greek. Unlike Viteau and Hilgenfeld, Wright argues that the Greek of the *Psalms of Solomon* is obscure and uses a ‘modest vocabulary’, which would characterise it as ‘translation Greek’ (Wright, *Psalms*, p. 12).

Commentators who advocate a Hebrew original insist on the presence of Semitisms in the Greek text. Ryle and James (*ΨΑΛΜΟΙ*, p. lxxxiv; cf. Gray, 'Psalms', p. 627), for example, consider the negative construct οὐ...πᾶς as the expression of a 'Hebraic idiom' (cf. *Pss. Sol.* 2.9, οὐκ ἐποίησε πᾶς ἄνθρωπος; and 17.27, οὐ κατοικήσει πᾶς ἄνθρωπος). Other linguistic features of the text usually linked to Hebrew syntax are the prominence of parataxis, the relative absence of grammatical conjunctions except for καί and the use of the expression ἐν τῷ with the infinitive, which occurs 21 times in the *Psalms* (cf. Ryle and James, *ΨΑΛΜΟΙ*, p. lxxx).

The *Psalms* also contain some rare words and *hapax legomena* such as the genitive μῆνισεως from the otherwise unattested μῆνισις 'anger' in *Pss. Sol.* 2.23 instead of the more common μῆνις (genitive μῆνιος or μῆνιδος; cf. Gen. 49.7; Num. 35.21; Sir. 27.30; 28.5). The noun ἀναμίξις 'promiscuous intercourse' in *Pss. Sol.* 2.13 occurs only here in the LXX and is rare in Greek literature, with the exception of Plutarch who uses it some 15 times.

The word διάψαλμα, which occurs 73 times in the canonical Psalms and three times in Habakkuk as a LXX rendition of the obscure Hebrew הַלֵּס, features twice in the *Psalms of Solomon* in 17.29 and 18.9. The presence of the expression in the collection could point to a Hebrew original of the text. It would be consistent with the use of the word הַלֵּס in other non-canonical psalms in Second Temple Judaism (cf. 4Q381 21.2, 24a+b.3; 33a, b+35.6; 11Q11 VI.3, 6 and 14). It is possible, however, that the use of διάψαλμα in the *Psalms* may not be an original feature of the text, but a later interpolation designed to emulate the canonical Psalms. Ryle and James (*ΨΑΛΜΟΙ*, p. 140) observe that the word διάψαλμα does not occur consistently in all Greek manuscripts of the *Psalms*, and therefore conclude that its use 'very likely is not genuine'.

Linguistically the *Psalms of Solomon* have been deemed to be close to the Greek of Ezekiel and the canonical Psalms. Some scholars have interpreted the style of the *Psalms* as an 'imitation' (Wright, 'Psalms', p. 646) or 're-reading' (Horbury 'Remembrance', p. 123) of the canonical Psalter. For example, the use of the expression χρηστὸς ὁ κύριος (*Pss. Sol.* 2.36 and 10.2), which is a frequent idiom in the canonical Psalms in the LXX (cf. *Pss.* 24.8; 33.9; 68.17; 99.5; 105.1; 106.1; 135.1; 144.9), could indicate an intentional attempt to imitate the canonical Psalms.

IV. Translation and Composition

Concerning the original language of the collection, there is no material evidence of a Hebrew *Vorlage* for the text. Wellhausen (*Die Phariseer*, p. 135), however, believed that the work had originally been written in Hebrew. According to Wellhausen, the Greek of the LXX had become authoritative ('*massgebend*', *Die Phariseer*, p. 137) among translators from Hebrew into Greek in Hellenistic times, which would explain the similarities between the *Psalms of Solomon* and the translations of the LXX. Wellhausen's observations, however, cannot rule out the possibility that the author of the *Psalms* may have written directly in Greek under the influence of the LXX. As mentioned above, Wright argues that the modesty of the vocabulary and the obscurity of some passages would suggest that the *Psalms of Solomon* should be seen as a translation rather than an imitation (Wright, 'Psalms', p. 640). The limited vocabulary, however, does not constitute a compelling argument for the existence of a Hebrew *Vorlage*. The *Psalms* are a relatively short work and employ conventional hymnic language which could explain the use of a modest vocabulary. The obscurity of the text alone, unless ascribable directly to an apparent mistranslation of a Semitic original, is not sufficient evidence that it is a translation.

Among the first commentators on the collection, Hilgenfeld (*Messias*) had argued that the *Psalms* had originally been written in Greek. Hilgenfeld, however, downplayed the importance of the Hebraisms of the text, provoking Wellhausen's polemical reaction (*Die Phariseer*, p. 135). Purported Hebraisms in the text, however, need careful consideration as some of them could reproduce linguistic features of the Greek of the LXX. As mentioned above, Ryle and James list the substitution of temporal clauses with the phrase ἐν τῷ with the infinitive among features of the *Psalms* 'symptomatic of a Hebrew translation' (*ΨΑΛΜΟΙ*, p. lxxx). The construction occurs more than 90 times in the LXX of Ezekiel, more than 60 in the canonical Psalms and more than 50 times in the Greek of 2 Chronicles as a translation of the Hebrew כִּי with the infinitive construct. The same phrase, however, is frequent in the Greek of the Gospel of Luke and Acts, where it cannot be evidence of a Hebrew original, although it could indicate the influence of the Greek of the LXX on Luke.

An indirect contribution to the question of the original language of the collection may be found in the work of those who studied the Syriac text of the *Psalms of Solomon*. Trafton (*Syriac Version*) has questioned the dependence of the Syriac text on the Greek and has argued that the Syriac translation was made directly from a Hebrew original. According to Trafton, passages where the Syriac suggests a direct knowledge of the Greek could be explained by the hypothesis that the Syriac translator had compared his work with the Greek version (*Syriac Version*, p. 15). If Trafton is correct, the presence of Hebraisms in the Syriac translation could constitute evidence for a Hebrew *Vorlage* of the *Psalms of Solomon*.

Even though it is likely that the *Psalms* were originally written in Hebrew, the evidence for the existence of a Hebrew *Vorlage* of the book remains inadequate. The *Psalms of Solomon*, therefore, remain an ‘ideal candidate’ (Davila, ‘(How)’, p. 61) for the quest for a more refined methodology for the identification of the original language of Greek pseudepigrapha.

V. Key Text-Critical Issues

In *Pss. Sol.* 17.32, some authors have proposed an emendation of the expression $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\delta\varsigma\ \kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ to $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\delta\varsigma\ \kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\upsilon$ (cf. *Pss. Sol.* 18.1, 5, 7). Ryle and James (*ΨΑΛΜΟΙ*, p. 141–42) claim that this is ‘perhaps the “crux” of the whole book’ and argue that the expression could be a mistranslation of an original משיח יהוה (cf. LXX Lam. 4.20). The fact that already the LXX of Lam. 4.20 mistranslated the construction in a similar way suggests that an emendation might be appropriate.

The expression could perhaps be explained as a Christian interpolation. Since the text of the *Psalms of Solomon* is otherwise free of apparent Christian interpolations, however, the insertion of a Christian interpolation at this point in the composition would be rather unnecessary and inexplicable. Moreover, the Gospel of Luke shows that both the expression $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\delta\varsigma\ \kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ (cf. Lk. 2.11) and the expression $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\delta\varsigma\ \kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\upsilon$ (cf. Lk. 2.26) were acceptable in Christian circles, which makes the hypothesis of a Christian interpolation even less compelling.

VI. Ideology and Exegesis

The *Psalms of Solomon* have been often cited as an example of the messianic expectations which characterised certain Jewish circles of the Second Temple period. *Psalms of Solomon* 17.21 has received particular attention as it refers to the Davidic descent of the Messiah. Wright has pointed out that the *Psalms* seem to offer a conceptual ‘intersection’ between the representations of the Messiah sent by God in the Old Testament and their further development in the New Testament (‘Psalms’, p. 646). Directly connected with the belief system of the *Psalms* is also the question of the circle or the Jewish sect within which the collection may have originated. Some commentators (Wellhausen, *Die Pharisäer*; Ryle and James, *ΨΑΛΜΟΙ*; Gray, ‘Psalms’) have argued that the *Psalms* may have been written in a Pharisaic environment. These authors focus in particular on the presence in the *Psalms* of elements variously associated with Pharisaic piety such as references to the resurrection (cf. *Pss. Sol.* 3.12), the frequent use of the expression ὄσσιοι as a possible rendering of the Hebrew מַסִּידִים, and a polemical stance against aristocratic members of the Sanhedrin (*Pss. Sol.* 4). Wright (*Psalms*, p. 122 n. 25) has argued that ‘these psalms could not have been written by Sadducees’, favouring the hypothesis of a Pharisaic provenance. Atkinson (*I Cried to the Lord*, pp. 211–20) thinks that the *Psalms* contain references to synagogue practice, and Wright argues that the author’s circle ‘worshipped apart from the Temple’ (*Psalms*, p. 10). Horbury (‘Remembrance’, p. 122 n. 25), however, tends to mitigate the effects of the author’s critique against the corruption of the priests, suggesting that the *Psalms* do not imply separation from the Temple cult. Owing to the inadequacy of historical evidence about the Pharisees in Hasmonean and Herodian times, however, the attribution remains somewhat speculative.

A major theme of the *Psalms of Solomon* is theodicy and the suffering of the righteous. The book opens with the author’s dramatic cry for help in the face of the enemy (*Pss. Sol.* 1.1) and then describes the capitulation of the city (*Pss. Sol.* 2.1) and the exile of its population (*Pss. Sol.* 2.6). These events narrated in the book are seen as a national calamity and are compared to the Babylonian captivity (*Pss. Sol.* 9.1–2). In this time of crisis, the major concern of the author is to demonstrate God’s righteousness. After Sirach and Isaiah, *Psalms of Solomon* is the book of

the LXX with the highest number of occurrences of the verb *δικαίω* ‘to justify’ or ‘to prove right’ (seven times). In contrast to Sirach and Isaiah, however, the one who is proved right in all the occurrences of *δικαίω* in the *Psalms* is God, his judgement (*Pss. Sol.* 4.8) or his name (*Pss. Sol.* 8.26). If God punishes the righteous, he is proven to be a just judge because the righteous have also sinned, though their sins may often be ascribed to ignorance (cf. *Pss. Sol.* 3.8; 13.7; 18.4) rather than malice. Confronted by defeat and suffering, the righteous (Gr. *δίκαιος*) or the saint (Gr. *ῥστος*) who endures the present trial will find mercy from God (*Pss. Sol.* 16.14-15).

Characteristic of the *Psalms of Solomon* is also the emphasis on the pedagogical character of human suffering. The terms *παιδεία* ‘discipline’ (eleven times), *παιδεύω* ‘to discipline’ (five times) and *παιδευτής* ‘the one who disciplines’ (once) are prominent in the *Psalms*. If the righteousness of God is shown by his impartial punishment of those who have sinned, God’s disciplinary action against the sins of the righteous cannot compare with the horrors of the destruction which awaits the inveterate sinner (*Pss. Sol.* 13.6-7). The chastisement of the lapsed righteous must be seen in the wider context of God’s faithfulness (*Pss. Sol.* 14.1) as an occasion for instruction and purification and a ‘beneficial effect’ (Sanders, ‘R. Akiba’s View’, p. 333). Those who receive God’s rebuke will be kept from evil paths and purified by God’s scourge (*Pss. Sol.* 10.1). The righteous should not then turn away from the source of his salvation (*Pss. Sol.* 3.5), but seek to atone through fasting and self-abasement in a quasi-ascetical manner (*Pss. Sol.* 3.8).

These references to religious practice and spiritual endurance allude to an often neglected aspect of the book. Beyond any consideration of their contribution to the history and theology of Second Temple Judaism, the *Psalms of Solomon* remains a work of devotion. Wright (*Psalms*, p. 7) has argued that if the mention of the *διάψαλμα* is authentic, this could point to a liturgical use of the *Psalms*. Horbury (‘Remembrance’, p. 112) has stressed how *Pss. Sol.* 3, 6 and 16 are particularly concerned with the theme of prayer. Despite their unsystematic references to historical events, the *Psalms of Solomon* are essentially a hymnbook and are therefore more concerned with devotion than historiography. Wellhausen (*Die Phariseer*, p. 117) has observed that the *Psalms* are ultimately not concerned with history as a mere chronicle of military and political

actions, but with history as a spiritual event and as an occasion to experience God's just judgement on a cosmic level as well as in personal devotion.

As Horbury ('Remembrance', p. 121) has argued, theodicy, devotion and asceticism cannot be separated in the *Psalms of Solomon*. The author of the *Psalms* promotes an idea of devotion as ascetic training, where the present affliction is an occasion to show the steadfastness and loyalty of the suffering righteous. According to Horbury ('Remembrance', p. 128) this element anticipates and prepares for the spirituality and ascetic piety of Christian monasticism.

VII. Reception History

Similarities between the *Psalms of Solomon* and other Jewish apocrypha and pseudepigrapha have been observed by some commentators. Most of these parallels, however, should be ascribed to similar readings of Scriptural passages and developments of a biblical theme, as, for example, when comparing the *Psalms* with the book of Sirach (Ryle and James, *ΨΑΛΜΟΙ*, pp. lxiii–lxv). The only textual resemblance between the *Psalms of Solomon* and Jewish apocrypha is the resemblance between *Pss. Sol.* 11 and Baruch 5. According to Wright ('Psalms', p. 648), either Bar. 5.5-8 depends on *Pss. Sol.* 11.2-5, or both texts depend on a common archetype. Viteau (*Psaumes*, p. 149) has adopted the opposite hypothesis and has argued that *Pss. Sol.* 11 depends on Baruch 5.

Patristic references to the *Psalms of Solomon* are rare and all date from the fifth century C.E. onwards, suggesting that the book did not have vast circulation in the earliest centuries of Christianity. An important piece of evidence for the diffusion of the *Psalms* in Christian circles is the mention of the *Psalms of Solomon* in the index of the fifth-century Codex Alexandrinus. In this Codex the book is listed after the New Testament and the *Pseudo-Clementines*, which could suggest that in some Christian circles the *Psalms* had attained the status of Scripture. As the final portion of the manuscript has been lost, however, Codex Alexandrinus cannot contribute further to our knowledge of the Greek text of the *Psalms*. Most references to the *Psalms of Solomon* in Patristic literature are found in catalogues of canonical and deuterocanonical books, where the *Psalms* are usually listed among the apocryphal books. Wright

(*Psalms*, p. 3) thinks that canon 59 of the Council of Laodicea (fourth century C.E.), which condemns the reading of ‘psalms composed by private individuals’ (Gr. ἰδιωτικοῦς ψαλμοῦς) in the church, might refer to a condemnation of the liturgical use of the *Psalms of Solomon* in early Christianity.

Bibliography

- Atkinson, K., *I Cried to the Lord: A Study of the Psalms of Solomon's Historical Background and Social Setting* (JSJSup 84; Leiden: Brill, 2004).
- Davila, J.R., ‘(How) Can We Tell if a Greek Apocryphon or Pseudepigraphon Has Been Translated from Hebrew or Aramaic?’, *JSP* 15 (2005), pp. 3–61.
- De la Cerda, I.L., *Adversaria Sacra* (Lyon: Sump. Ludouici Prost Haeredis Roville, 1626).
- Fabricius, J.A. (ed.), *Codex pseudepigraphus veteris Testamenti* (2 vols.; 2nd ed.; Hamburg: Sump. Theodori Christoph. Felginer, 1722–23).
- Fritzsche, O.F. (ed.), *Libri apocryphi Veteris Testamenti Graece* (Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus, 1871).
- Gebhardt, O. von (ed.), *ΨΑΛΜΟΙ ΣΟΛΟΜΩΝΤΟΣ: Die Psalmen Salomo's zum ersten Male mit Benutzung der Atheshandschriften und des Codex Casanatensis* (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1895).
- Geiger, E.E. (ed.), *Die Psalter Salomo's: herausgegeben und erklärt* (Augsburg: J. Wolff, 1871).
- Gray, G.B., ‘The Psalms of Solomon’, in *APOT*, II, pp. 625–52.
- Hann, R.R., *The Manuscript History of the Psalms of Solomon* (Chico: Scholars Press, 1982).
- Hilgenfeld, A., *Messias Judaeorum* (Leipzig: R. Reisland, 1869).
- Horbury, W., ‘The Remembrance of God in the *Psalms of Solomon*’, in S.C. Barton (ed.), *Memory in the Bible and Antiquity* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), pp. 111–28.
- Nieremberg, Iohannes Eusebius, *De origine sacrae scripturae libri duodecim* (Lyon: Sump. Petri Prost, 1641).
- Ryle, H.E., and M.R. James (eds.), *ΨΑΛΜΟΙ ΣΟΛΟΜΩΝΤΟΣ: The Psalms of the Pharisees, Commonly Called the Psalms of Solomon, Text Edited, with Introduction and English* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1891).
- Sanders, E.P., ‘R. Akiba's View of Suffering’, *JQR* 63 (1973), pp. 332–51.
- Swete, H.B. (ed.), *The Psalms of Solomon: With the Greek Fragments of the Book of Enoch* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1899).
- Trafton, J.L., *The Syriac Version of the Psalms of Solomon: A Critical Evaluation* (Atlanta: Scholars Press 1985).

- Viteau, F.M. (ed.), *Les Psaumes de Salomon. Introduction, texte Grec et traduction* (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1911).
- Wellhausen, J., *Die Pharisäer und die Sadducäer. Eine Untersuchung zur inneren jüdischen Geschichte* (Greifswald: L. Bamberg, 1874).
- Wright, R.B., 'Psalms of Solomon', in *OTP*, vol. II, pp. 639–70.
- The Psalms of Solomon: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text* (London: T&T Clark International, 2007).

The Minor Prophets

Jennifer M. Dines

Editions

(a) Standard Greek Editions

Göttingen, vol. XIII, *Duodecim Prophetæ* (Ziegler, 1984 repr.).
Rahlfs-Hanhart, vol. II, pp. 490–565.
Swete, vol. III, pp. 1–100.

(b) Dead Sea Scrolls

Minor Prophets (Ego *et al.*, 2005).
The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever (Tov, 1990).

(c) Modern Translations

NETS (Howard, 2007), pp. 777–822.
LXX.D (Bons *et al.*, 2009), pp. 1165–1229.
Bd'A 23.1 (Bons, Joosten, and Kessler, 2002); 23.4–9 (Harl *et al.*, 1999);
23.10–11 (Casevitz *et al.*, 2007); 23.12 (Vianès, 2011).

(d) Additional Comments

The earliest manuscript witness is the third-century C.E. Washington papyrus (W), fragmentary for Hosea and the beginning of Amos, and with many lacunae elsewhere but, despite revisions towards the Hebrew, an important pre-Hexaplaric witness. The earliest complete codices are Vaticanus (B, fourth century, mainly reliable for XII); Alexandrinus (A, fifth century, with expansions and harmonisations, but also preserving ancient readings); Sinaiticus (S, fourth century, lacking Hosea, Amos and Micah; generally less reliable than B). For these and subsequent witnesses, see Swete, *Intro.*, pp. 144–48, 165–68.

I. General Characteristics

The earliest reference to ‘the twelve prophets’ occurs in Sir. 49.10 (second century B.C.E.); they are not named. The title ‘Minor Prophets’ was coined by Augustine (fifth century C.E.) to distinguish these short books from Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel (*de Civitate Dei* 18.29). Modern terminology also includes ‘the Dodekapropheton’, ‘the Book of the Twelve’, ‘the Twelve’, or ‘XII’, the form used here. For ease of reference, standard anglicised names will be used; for the various Greek spellings, see Swete, *Intro.*, pp. 198–214.

a. XII as a Collection

Despite the books being of varying length, content and style, and attributed to twelve different prophets, the earliest manuscript evidence, Hebrew and Greek alike, shows that XII were always grouped together and not interspersed with other books. Each book could, however, be read separately (cf. the *pesharim*) and, until recently, this was the practice in modern scholarship. Nowadays, however, there is greater awareness of XII as a collection, although without agreement as to the implications. Some scholars understand Hebrew XII as essentially a selection of independent texts grouped for convenience on one scroll (Muraoka, ‘Introduction’, p. i); others as purposefully edited in several stages (Nogalski, *Redactional*). Between the extremes lies an understanding of XII as a loose anthology of texts with shared themes and vocabulary (Collins, *Mantle*, pp. 59–87). For the LXX, too, scholars first concentrated on individual books, but now also show interest in how the translator treated the texts as a group, and whether there are emphases differing from MT (Jones, *Formation*; Sweeney, *Form*, pp. 175–88).

Despite occasional arguments for two or more translators, there is a significant consensus that LXX XII had one translator. For a summary of the debate, see Jones, *Formation*, pp. 88–90.

b. Sequence

Hebrew and Greek sources order the first six books differently; this affects the overall thrust of each collection. The Hebrew order is Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah. The so-called Greek order consists of Hosea, Amos, Micah, Joel, Obadiah, Jonah. In both cases, the last six

books are Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi. The Hebrew order is attested in Hebrew sources from the second and first centuries B.C.E. (4QXII^{b,c,e,g}), and in Greek sources from the first century B.C.E. (8HēvXIIgr). The Greek order is clearly attested only from the third century C.E. in W and in Christian manuscripts thereafter; this puts its antiquity in doubt.

c. Translational Character

The aim has clearly been to render the Hebrew source-text as closely as possible; XII thus has affinity with translations characterised as ‘literal’ rather than ‘free’ (see § IV). There is, however, considerable flexibility, with word-choice often reflecting context and style. The translator’s Koine Greek is usually good, sometimes elegant, although marked by Semitic interference and stereotyping common in LXX. He has a wide vocabulary, indicating a certain educational level. His Hebrew is generally competent; ‘mistakes’ are not always due to ignorance. The translation lacks *kaige* features; this shows up in comparison with 8HēvXIIgr, the fragmentary scroll from Naḥal Hēver which sporadically revises LXX towards the proto-Masoretic text and has many *kaige* characteristics.

Translational practices and lexical choices suggest that XII may share translators with at least parts of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Similarities with Ezekiel 1–27; 40–48 and Jeremiah 1–29 were first identified by Thackeray (‘Greek Translators’, pp. 578–85); this is cautiously upheld by more recent scholars, including Tov and Muraoka. Systematic study is needed to clarify these groupings. One approach attempts to identify places where one translation draws on another. Although the influence of LXX Pentateuch is evident (e.g., Hos. 12.3 and Gen. 32.29; Joel 2.21, 22 and Gen. 35.17; Exod. 14.13; Jon. 1.2 and Gen. 18.20–21), the order of translation of Jeremiah, Ezekiel and XII is unclear; soundings suggest that Ezekiel came first (Muraoka, ‘Introduction’, p. xiii). LXX XII may have been known to the translator of Isaiah (Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version*, pp. 224–27), though some disagree (e.g., Dogniez, ‘L’Indépendance’). A reference to LXX Amos 9.11 in LXX Dan. 11.14 clinches the order here (Dines, ‘King’s Good Servant’, pp. 215–17). It is unclear whether XII preceded Psalms, or vice versa.

II. Time and Place of Composition

As LXX XII know the LXX Pentateuch, the XII belong plausibly to the second century B.C.E. Some scholars suggest an early second-century date, often using the tentative datings in *BGS*, p. 111; most suggest the middle of the century. Firmer dating might be achieved if internal evidence from Isaiah could establish a date ca. 145 B.C.E. (Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version*) or ca. 140 (Van der Kooij, *Oracle of Tyre*), and if LXX Isaiah could be proven to have followed LXX XII, but there are many uncertainties. Some passages which may hint at violent persecution could reinforce an early Maccabean context (Amos 4.2; Hab. 2.15) but, for the moment, there is no clinching evidence. Linguistically, the translation reflects the Koine of the third to first centuries B.C.E. The absence of *kaige* features might suggest earlier rather than later second-century dating, but *kaige* revision is unlikely to have been a purely chronological process.

An Egyptian milieu is universally assumed. Given the translator's use of supposedly Egyptian terminology (e.g., *κτῆμα* 'vine', Hos. 2.15[17]; *ἀνδρίζομαι* 'be courageous', Mic. 2.1[2]; Nah. 4.10; *ἄφεις* 'irrigation channel', Joel 1.20; 3.18), this is plausible, though not conclusive. A wide technical knowledge, including architecture (Amos 3.15; 9.1; Joel 2.17; Nah. 2.9; Zeph. 1.16; 2.14; Hag. 1.4), medicine (Hos. 6.1; Nah. 3.19), warfare (Obadiah *passim*; Nah. 2.6; 3.10; Mal. 1.4) and agriculture (Amos 4.9; Joel 3.10; Nah. 1.10; Zeph. 2.14; Hag. 2.16) suggests a comprehensive education and makes Alexandria a likely locus, although there were Greek-speaking Jewish communities elsewhere in Egypt and beyond (e.g., Leontopolis in Egypt or Cyrene).

III. Language

The translation displays remarkably regular characteristics. Like other parts of LXX, it is a hybrid of normal Koine Greek and a Semitised form which follows the Hebrew word-order rather than that natural to Greek, and translates many Hebrew idioms literally. There is a penchant, characteristic of Hellenistic Greek, for compound verbs. The emphatic negative οὐ μὴ with subjunctive occurs frequently; the optative is rare (Jon. 2.8[7]). There appear to be few neologisms (apart from coinages already

attested in the Pentateuch)—notable examples include: πνευματόφορος ‘bearing the spirit, inspired’ (Hos. 9.7), ὄσφρασία ‘odour’ (Hos. 14.7); πρόσκαυμα ‘result of burning, soot’ (Joel 2.6; Nah. 2.11); ἀνεμοφθορία ‘blasting, blight’ (Hag. 2.17); κατάκαρπος ‘fruitful’ (Zech. 2.4[8]).

IV. Translation and Composition

The Hebrew of XII is often extremely difficult, posing problems for modern translators too. Hosea, Micah, Nahum and Habakkuk present constant challenges, but all the books contain problematic words and phrases with which the translator is manifestly struggling. Only rarely is the underlying Hebrew likely to have been much different from MT. Occasionally, LXX pluses are confirmed by pre-Masoretic Hebrew texts: the uncharacteristic expansion in Hos. 13.4 (stressing creation; cf. Amos 4.13) is attested in 4QXII^c, the smaller plus in Amos 1.3 has a Hebrew counterpart in 5QXII Amos and the pluses in Nah. 1.14; 3.8 are perhaps present in 4QpNah. But usually it is an open question whether or not substantial alterations, as distinct from minor adjustments for clarification or harmonisation, are the work of the translator. In fact, substantial pluses are rare in XII; apart from Hos. 13.4, the most notable occur in Hag. 2.9, 14; Mal. 1.1 (see Jones, *Formation*, pp. 93–118 for other examples).

a. Characteristic Practices

- a) A mainly quantitative rendering of the Hebrew, with relatively little paraphrase, except where the Hebrew is particularly difficult (e.g., Amos 4.2-3; Hab. 3.15; Zeph. 1.14; Mal. 3.23). This feature distinguishes LXX XII from, say, LXX Isaiah.
- b) An absence of transliterations except for presumed proper nouns (e.g., Amos 1.6, 9, Σαλωμων ‘Solomon’ for שלמה ‘complete’; Zech. 14.10, Ραμα δέ for וראמה ‘and will be high’), and established stereotypes like σάββατα for שבת (cf. Zech. 1.7). Where obscure or technical Hebrew words occur, Greek equivalents are found. So ‘nazirites’ in Amos 3.12 become ‘consecrated ones’ (but Judg. 13.5, ναζιρ); ‘teraphim’ are interpreted in Hos. 3.4 as ‘revealers’ and in Zech. 10.2 as ‘utterers’ (but Judg. 17.5, θεραφιν); ‘the satan’ in Zech. 3.1 is ‘an accuser’ (but 3 Kgdms

11.14, *σαταν*). Hebrew weights and measures normally receive Greek equivalents (Amos 8.5; Nah. 3.14; Hag. 2.16; Zech. 3.5); the major exception is Hos. 3.2, where *חמר* is transliterated *γομορ* (but perhaps a deliberate play on *Γομερ* in 1.3 as *gamma* does not normally represent *heth*). Sometimes, however, words clearly intended in MT as place names are interpreted etymologically as common nouns (Hos. 5.8; Amos 1.12; 5.5). The almost complete absence of transliterated common nouns is a marked trait; it aligns XII with Psalms, Proverbs, Job, Ezekiel *α*, Jeremiah *α*, Isaiah and OG Daniel, where transliteration is infrequent compared with Judges, Kingdoms, Paralipomena (Chronicles), 2 Esdras and Th. Daniel.

- c) The addition of verbs, pronouns and other words, usually for harmonisation or clarification. Harmonisations include Hos. 8.13 which matches 9.3; Hag. 2.21 which matches 2.6. Clarifications include additions of verbs in Hos. 14.8; Amos 3.11 (for fuller lists, see Jones, *Formation*, pp. 97–109). There are relatively few minuses; usually only for producing more streamlined Greek (Hos. 10.15; Zech. 6.12-13; see also Mic. 1.11; Nah. 1.12; Hag. 2.5).
- d) Many divergences from MT result from interpretations of unpointed Hebrew in *scriptio continua* different from those of the later Masoretes. All books of XII provide examples of confusions between similar letters, different word and verse divisions, metathesis of consonants producing different words and other apparently mechanical changes (see introductions to *Bd'A* for examples). These are sometimes taken to indicate the translator's poor grasp of Hebrew; sometimes this may be so, but often they suggest attempts to cope with difficult Hebrew, extracting what presumably yielded the best sense. Where a choice is between two familiar words, contextual, exegetical or theological reasons may have exerted an influence. In Hab. 3.5, for instance, where *דבר* is construed as *דְּבַר* 'word' and not as MT *דְּבַר* 'plague', it may have seemed appropriate for a prophetic 'word' to precede the Lord, especially as the parallel term *רשף* has not been understood.

- e) Hebrew word order is nearly always reproduced, often to the detriment of the Greek. Occasional deviations then repay attention (Amos 5.14, 26; Hag. 2.4).
- f) Consistent stereotyping of Hebrew expressions and constructions resembles other books of the LXX; Muraoka gives examples ('Introduction', pp. xvi–xviii). Another kind of stereotyping consists in a preference for one of a pair of synonyms, such as the exclusive use of *ρόμφαία* rather than *μάχαιρα* to render *כרפ* 'sword' (with a single exception in Zech. 11.17); by contrast, LXX Isaiah always uses *μάχαιρα* (except in Isa. 66.16). For 'sin' words, the translator regularly chooses *ἁμαρτία* for *חטא*, *ἀσεβεία* for *עוון*, and *ἀδικία* for *עוול*, except in Amos 3.2 (*ἀδικία*) and Zech. 3.4 (*ἀνομία*).
- g) Favourite words such as *παντοκράτωρ*, *παιδεία*, *ὑπομονή*, *εὐλαβέομαι* and many more recur throughout (see Ziegler, 'Die Einheit', pp. 11–15; Muraoka, 'Introduction', p. xix).
- h) The translator was interested in style as well as content. Although no systematic study has yet been undertaken, examples in *Bd'A* introductions reveal a remarkable degree of consistency. The rhetorical device of *variatio* (avoidance of repetition) occurs frequently, the same Hebrew word being rendered by two or more Greek synonyms (Amos 7.8; 8.1; Mic. 7.14; Joel 1.19, 20; Jon. 1.12, 15), as does the opposite device whereby different Hebrew words are rendered by the same word in Greek (Amos 9.14, 15; Joel 3.2; Nah. 1.6). Occasionally new verbal patterns are created, the most elaborate occurring in Amos 1.3–2.7 (Dines, *Septuagint*, pp. 55–56; cf. Hos. 4.12–Zech. 10.1, renderings of *לש*). The translator sometimes creates small symmetrical groups, often triadic (Amos 2.14–15; Hag. 1.9, 10; Zech. 10.7), and alternating pairs of words across several sections of a book (e.g., Hos. 5.2–13.4, *ἐγὼ δέ, καὶ ἐγώ*), or between books (Hab. 2.6–Zeph. 2.18, *οὐαί, ὦ*). There is often creative handling of poetic passages, such as in Jonah 2; Habakkuk 3 and Nahum (though the opening acrostic is not reproduced; see Dines, 'Stylistic').

V. Text-Critical Issues

The use of LXX to correct MT, although no longer the primary function of LXX study, remains significant. For XII, Barthélemy finds few places where the LXX is preferable to MT (see in detail *Critique*, pp. 497–1038). The possibility of recreating *Vorlagen* by retroversion is studied by Tov (*Text-Critical*), with occasional examples from XII. For each book, textual uncertainties are documented in Ziegler's first apparatus, and are discussed in commentaries. Shared material in Mic. 4.1-4 and Isa. 2.2-5 is a crucial test for theories about the order of translation of these books.

Five manuscripts have a version of Habbakuk 3 differing from LXX. Thackeray thought this represented another translation antedating LXX, but Fernández Marcos has shown that it reflects a later revision in the style of Symmachus (*BGS*, p. 100). It is called the 'Barberini Version' after MS 86 (Barberinus graecus 549). See further *Bd'A* 23.4-9, pp. 245–46.

VI. Ideology and Exegesis

An issue in LXX studies as a whole is whether translators introduced their own agendas or whether apparently tendentious changes are accidental results of an attempted literal translation. A further question for XII is whether coherent emphases, different from those in MT, can be identified across the individual books. A systematic study remains to be done, but sample studies (*Bd'A*; Dines, 'Amos'; Palmer, 'Not Made' [Zechariah]); Glenny, *Finding* [Amos]) and some thematic soundings (Dogniez, 'Fautes'; Sweeney, *Form*, pp. 189–209) suggest this may be the case. Some consider it unthinkable that translators imposed their own views on the text, although no one doubts that their understanding was sometimes affected by contemporary events or concerns. Others understand the relationship between translator and text differently: in the context of a living community, texts were not fixed but continually readjusted and re-appropriated. Potentially significant touches occur throughout XII and it is possible to identify recurring peculiarities which may point to concerns and beliefs held by the translator. By and large, however, LXX XII

reproduce the content, and thus the ideology, of the Hebrew very closely. Particular emphases, which plausibly come from the translator and not the *Vorlage*, include the following:

a. God as ‘Pantokrator’

The divine title צבאות (יהוה), ‘(LORD of) hosts/armies’, is consistently rendered as (κύριος ὁ) παντοκράτωρ, ‘(the Lord the) Almighty’, and not by τῶν δυνάμεων, the default rendering in Psalms (except for Zeph. 2.9; Zech. 7.4; 13.2, where there are, however, text-critical problems). The absence of Σαβαωθ (found in LXX Isaiah) is not surprising, given the translator’s reluctance to transliterate. The earliest occurrence of παντοκράτωρ seems to be in XII, although there are later attestations in non-biblical sources (Dafni, ‘ΠΑΝΤΟΚΡΑΤΩΡ’, pp. 443–47). Dogniez (‘Fautes’) argues that the term in XII presents God as universal creator and lord, rather than ‘Lord of armies’ exclusive to Israel; it thus carries important theological implications.

b. Treatment of Foreigners

There are some indications that XII have a broader vision of the destiny of the nations than in corresponding passages in MT. In Amos 9.12 the nationalistic promise of MT (‘that they may possess the remnant of Edom and all the nations’) is replaced in LXX by ὅπως ἐκζητήσωσιν οἱ κατάλοιποι τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη (‘that the survivors of mankind and all the nations...may seek [me]’), a rendering resulting from reading ירשו (‘possess’) as ידרשו (‘seek’), and (ignoring the *waw*) אדום (‘Edom’) as אדם (‘mankind’). It is striking that the final word of LXX Amos (9.15) is not אלהיך (‘thy God’, MT), but παντοκράτωρ, ‘the all-dominating’. For a detailed discussion, see Glenny, *Finding*, pp. 224–28.

In Mic. 4.2 MT has ‘so that he (God) may teach us (the peoples) his ways’, but LXX renders ‘and they (the Jews) will show us (the peoples) his ways’. There may be a touch of ‘theological correctness’ here, avoiding the possibility that God will teach pagans directly, but perhaps also a celebration of the exalted role promised to Jews, in line with Zech. 2.11; 8.20–23; 14.16. Some doubt the authenticity at Zeph. 3.10 of MT’s ‘my suppliants, my scattered ones’, but Barthélemy defends this reading which narrows the reference to Diaspora Jews. The LXX, with no

equivalent for עֲתָרִי בַת־פּוֹצִי, keeps the universalistic outlook of 3.9, rendering ‘that all might call on the name of the Lord’.

In some passages an animosity not present in MT can be discerned: hostility towards ‘Canaanites’ (Hos. 4.18; 12.7; Zeph. 1.11; Zech. 14.21); in Mal. 3.19, reading זָדִים ‘arrogant’ as זָרִים ‘foreigners’, resulting in ‘all the foreigners’ being destroyed; and references to Aram/Syria sometimes betraying hostility, perhaps because Syria was part of the Seleucid empire controlling Palestine. References to Damascus absent in MT (Amos 3.12; Zeph. 2.9, 10) may share this last tendency. An anti-Syrian/Seleucid stance has been suspected in Amos 1.3-5, 15; 3.12; 9.7. Antagonism towards Samaritans, more marked in LXX than MT (Hos. 8.6; 13.2, 16; Amos 6.1; Mic. 1.7-8) merges with more typically negative references to the North. Both may become ciphers for the Seleucids (Glenny, *Finding*, pp. 149–84).

c. Israel and Judah

The sinfulness of the Northern Kingdom, Israel, is enhanced, often by an anomalous choice of past tenses. This merely foregrounds attitudes already built into the Hebrew, but is exacerbated perhaps by a contemporary identification of the North with the territory of the Samaritans. Passages which go beyond MT in demonising Israel include Hos. 5.11 (and often in Hosea) and Amos 4.4-5. Sometimes Judah is tarred with the same brush, as in Hos. 4.15; 6.10-11; 11.2. Conversely, Judah and Jerusalem are sometimes given greater prominence, or judged more leniently, suggesting that, even if the translator is a diaspora Jew, his allegiance is to Jerusalem—again, enhancing traits already present in Hebrew. Striking examples include: Amos 1.1; 6.1; Zeph. 2.7; 3.14, 18; Zech. 1.15, 21(2.4); 7.14; 8.8.

d. Theological Correctness

As elsewhere in LXX, there is inconsistency in handling anthropomorphic descriptions of God. In general, the translator takes these in his stride (Amos 9.4 [eyes]; Zeph. 1.4 [hand]; Zech. 14.4 [feet]). There are, however, some apparently sensitive areas. God does not ‘roar’ like a lion in Amos 1.2; Joel 3.16; and is not ‘pierced’ in Zech. 12.10. God is not directly responsible for punitive action (Hos. 9.12; 13.8; Zeph. 1.2-3),

though remains the subject in Amos 4.9; Zeph. 1.12; Mal. 4.5(6), and sometimes even becomes the subject (Hos. 10.15; Amos 4.13; Nah. 1.9; Zeph. 1.17; 3.16). Other theological adjustments include distancing God from paganism (Hos. 2.16; Amos 2.7) and from making immoral demands (Amos 4.4), preserving divine attributes (Hos. 8.4; Mic. 2.7; 3.7; Zech. 9.1), and maintaining right relationships (Mic. 7.8; Joel 2.28[3.1]; Jon. 1.6; 2.5[4], 8[7]; Nah. 1.7; Mal. 1.13; 2.10; 3.10, 15).

e. Messianism

Some scholars have detected more developed messianic expectation in LXX than in MT (see Knibb, *Septuagint and Messianism*, pp. 3–19). Attention focuses especially on three passages.

The divergent reading in Amos 4.13 of *χριστὸν αὐτοῦ* apparently renders **משיחוֹ* ('his anointed'), where MT has *מהשיחוֹ* ('what is his thought'). In its immediate context, this misreading/translational choice does not reveal much about what kind of 'anointed' person is envisaged, whether king or priest, and whether the allusion is to past, present or future. Glenny links the passage to 7.1 ('Gog the king') and 9.11–12 (restoration of the 'tent of David'), and argues for a more developed eschatological intention on the part of the translator (*Finding*, pp. 236–40). Munnich also thinks the intention is messianic, but comments that the plural *τοὺς χριστούς σου* in Hab. 3.13 envisages a collective restoration ('Le messianisme', pp. 347–48; cf. Dafni, 'ΤΙΑΝΤΟΚΡΑΤΩΡ').

In Hab. 2.3–4 the Greek is ambiguous. MT makes it clear that it is the 'vision' (*חִזוֹן*, masc.) which will come. In LXX, the feminine *ὄρασις* 'vision', renders *ὄρασις*, but is followed by masculine pronouns and participles (*αὐτόν, ἐρχόμενος*) whose antecedents are unclear; they may refer to *καιρὸν* 'appointed time' (NETS; *Bd'A*), but the masculine forms could equally well envisage a mysterious deliverer (Brenton; LXX.D); whether this person is Davidic/messianic is unclear. In 2.3, *ἀνατελεῖ* 'rise up', is perhaps significant in the light of Zech. 3.8; 6.12 (cf. Hos. 10.4); it was taken in this way in early Jewish and Christian interpretation. Finally, if there is any messianic thought in MT Hos. 11.1 ('from Egypt I called my son [*בְּנִי*]'), the LXX rules it out with the plural, 'I recalled his (i.e. Jacob's) children (*τὰ τέκνα αὐτοῦ*)'. The verb *μετεκάλεσα* 'recalled' (MT *קראתי*) may simply reflect the translator's preference for compound forms, but may also imply a limited time of exile in Egypt.

f. Education

Pedagogic and paraenetic concerns are prominent in XII and of considerable interest in the wider debate about why and for whom LXX translations were made. There is a pedagogic emphasis on the prophetic/divine word as παιδεία, ‘education’ (Amos 3.7; Hab. 1.12; Zeph. 3.2, 7), rendering Hebrew מוֹסֵר, יֹסֵר. These terms link ‘teaching’ with ‘discipline’, including punishment for sin as God’s means of bringing people to their senses. The verb παιδεύω occurs in Hos. 7.12, 15; 10.10; God is characterised as Israel’s teacher, παιδευτῆς (Hos. 5.2); Israel is punished for its ἀπαιδευσία (Hos. 7.16) and apostrophised as ἀπαιδευτον (Zeph. 2.1). The connotations of the Greek word-group overlap with those of the Hebrew (educating and training children), but also suggest the end-product: ‘education’, ‘culture’. ‘Chastisement’ is a nuance derived from Hebrew. This dominant word-group gives a particular stamp to XII. There is also a greater stress than in MT on ‘knowing’ (γιγνώσκω, and compounds, Hos. 9.2; 11.12; Mic. 4.9-11; Hag. 2.20[19]) and ‘knowledge’ (γνώσις, Hos. 10.12; cf. Mic. 7.8).

In places, the translation appears to encourage a personal response (paraenetic). This can be glimpsed from a number of small pluses and divergences involving imperatives, or first or second person speech: exhortatory pluses (Hos. 6.1; 14.3; Joel 1.8; 2.12, 27); imperatives and cohortatives (Hos. 10.12; Mic. 4.10; Joel 3.11); first/second person speech (Hos. 6.2-3; 11.10[9]; 14.3; Amos 5.15; Mic. 4.2; Mal. 1.1). Systematic study is needed to assess the significance of these features.

g. Sequence

In trying to understand XII as a whole, a particular problem is uncertainty about the order in which the books were translated. Whether or not the ‘Septuagintal’ order (not clearly attested before the third century C.E.) was that of the translator, it provides interesting exegetical connections.

In the Hebrew canonical order, the Day of the Lord, a dominant theme in XII, is first encountered in the second book, Joel, where it receives programmatic treatment: day of judgement for Israel (chs. 1–2); day of vindication and eschatological judgement of the nations (ch. 3). In LXX it appears first in Amos, where only Israel is judged. In MT the call to ‘beat ploughshares into swords’ (Joel 3[4 LXX].10) anticipates the assurance

that the situation will be reversed (Mic. 4.3). But in the ‘Greek’ order, Joel comes fourth, not second, following Micah, so that the sequence is reversed and peace is no longer the final word. In the Hebrew order, Micah separates Jonah, where Nineveh is spared, from Nahum, where it is not. In the Greek order, the juxtaposition of Jonah and Nahum makes for dramatic and paradoxical reading. Even where both sequences match, differences within books can be significant. Malachi, for instance, ends with Elijah in MT but Moses in LXX.

Until now, scholars have mainly debated which sequence came first by studying internal logic and coherence. Nogalski (*Redactional*) and Zapf (‘Perspective’), argue, on differing grounds, for the priority of MT’s order; Bogaert (‘L’organisation’) argues for that of LXX; Jones (‘Book of the Twelve’) suggests that both circulated independently. For the likelihood that the translator followed the Hebrew sequence, see Dines, ‘Verbal and Thematic Links’. Few so far have offered sustained exegetical readings of LXX XII (more exist for MT; but see Sweeney *Form*, pp. 175–86; Jeppesen ‘Lord God’). In fact, this kind of sequential reading is a recent development, allowing modern scholars to use intertextual and reader-response approaches fruitfully.

VII. Reception History

Nothing has been found at Qumran in Greek except 8HevXIIgr, whose association with the Bar Kochbah rebellion might suggest a nationalistic rather than a universalistic understanding. Some named prophets are integrated into Josephus’s narrative in *Antiquities* 9–11, especially Jonah (*Ant.* 9.205–214, an unusually detailed—though selective—retelling), and Nahum for whom, uniquely, Josephus creates a ‘setting in history’ in the reign of Jotham (746–736 B.C.E.), thus adding him to the eighth-century prophets. Nahum is also the only one of XII to be quoted verbatim (Nah. 2.9–14 in *Ant.* 9.239–242). Although Josephus’s text is usually taken to reflect MT rather than LXX, it accords with LXX for at least Nah. 9.12 (*Bd’A* 23.4–9, p. 187). Named only in passing are Micah, Haggai and Zechariah, probably because of historical references in Jeremiah and Chronicles. Josephus is not concerned with XII as such. Meanwhile in Philo none of the XII is named. Hosea 14.9–10 is quoted in *Mut.* 139; *Plant.* 138 (14.9 only); Zech. 6.12 in *Conf.* 62; there is

possibly an allusion to Obad. 18 in *Mos.* 1.179. The text is Greek-based, but not always identical with LXX.

Among later Jewish versions Barthélemy demonstrated that the Hexaplaric readings attributed to Theodotion for XII are late and eclectic, with many expansions (*Les devanciers*, pp. 253–60). Howard ('Quinta') queried Barthélemy's contention that Quinta readings for XII are to be identified with 8HevXIIgr, arguing that each is an independent example of the *kaige* text-type.

Apart from Sir. 49.10, XII appear only piecemeal in the Apocrypha. Tobit 2.6 quotes Amos 8.6 idiosyncratically (and anonymously), while Tob. 14.4 names Nahum as prophesying against Assyria (according to S; B and A wrongly name Jonah). *4 Ezra* 5.5 cites Hab. 2.11; *4 Ezra* 8.45 cites Joel 2.17; LXX Bel and the Dragon claims Habakkuk as author (v. 1) and involves him in the narrative (vv. 33-39). In the Pseudepigrapha (see Delamarter, *Scripture Index*) there are occasional references. Hosea 6.6 occurs, unattributed, in *Sib. Or.* 2.81-82; Zech. 2.5 in *Sib. Or.* 3.706; Zech. 13.8 in *Sib. Or.* 3.544; Joel 2.28-29 appears in *T. Jud.* 24.2. 3 Maccabees 6.8 alludes to the Jonah story. *Lives of the Prophets* and *Ascension of Isaiah* refer to XII by name (following the 'Greek' order). There is an *Apocalypse of Zephaniah*, and a *Homily on Jonah* once attributed to Philo. *Hellenistic Synagogal Prayers* 2.7 alludes to Mal. 1.11 and 11.7 to Jonah 3.

It is unclear whether XII were regarded as a unity for New Testament writers. Acts 7.42-43; 13.40-41; 15.15-17 are so understood by Jones (*Formation*, p. 10), but others are doubtful (Utzschneider, 'Flourishing', cautiously allows Acts 7.42-43). Citations and allusions are to individual texts. Muraoka counts 33 clear citations, compared with 72 from Isaiah, but only ten from Jeremiah and five from Ezekiel ('Introduction', p. ii); even taking only the 24 cited by Utzschneider ('Flourishing', pp. 276–77), XII were clearly important sources of proof-texts. Most citations are close to LXX, but with much textual diversity, either through manuscript variations or through texts being adapted to their contexts or quoted from memory. Citations from XII are often merged with those from other books, such as Mic. 5.1, 3 and 2 Kgdms 5.2 in Mt. 2.5-6; Zech. 9.9 and Isa. 62.11 in Mt. 21.5; Mal. 3.1 and Isa. 40.3 in Mk 1.2. Only Hosea (2.1 in Rom. 9.25-26) and Joel (3.1-5a in Acts 2.16-21, where the apparently

restrictive ‘some of [ἀπό] my spirit’ does not pose a problem) are mentioned by name; Zechariah is wrongly called Jeremiah in Mt. 27.9. Jonah is named, but not cited (Mt. 12.40, cf. Jon. 2.1; Lk. 11.29, cf. Jon. 3.5). Passages where distinctive LXX readings are important for exegesis include Hos. 6.6 (where ἔλεος, ‘pity’, ‘mercy’, renders ἔσπρη) in Mt. 9.13; 12.7; Amos 5.25-27 in Acts 7.42-43 (cf. CD VII, 14-15); Amos 9.11-12 in Acts 15.15-17 (cf. 4Q174). Sometimes, however, a reading closer to the Hebrew occurs where LXX would not have been so effective, as in Hos. 11.1 in Mt. 2.15; Zech. 12.10 in Jn 19.37 (where the proto-Lucianic ἐξέκέντησαν ‘pierced’ replaces LXX’s κατωρχήσαντο ‘danced’; see Palmer, ‘Not Made’, pp. 153–56; *Bd’A* 23.10-11, pp. 156–61).

With the exception of key texts from New Testament, XII seem at first to have played a modest role in Christian catechesis, homiletics and exegesis, although Hosea’s marriage-story was important in anti-Gnostic and ecclesiological argument (later, Amos 4.13 was a key text in disputes about the nature of the Holy Spirit; Dines, ‘Amos’, pp. 152–54). In the second century C.E., citations from XII in Justin Martyr are important for their witness to pre-Hexaplaric and *kaige* readings, while Tertullian’s many citations are valuable witnesses to Old Latin. In the mid-third century, Origen wrote continuous commentaries, predominantly typological and allegorical in nature, on all XII except Obadiah, although only a fragment on Hos. 12.5 is extant. Parts of Didymus the Blind’s allegorising commentary on Zechariah from ca. 387 C.E. were rediscovered in 1941. Also from the fourth and fifth centuries are complete commentaries by the Antiochenes Theodore of Mopsuestia (ca. 375 C.E.) and Theodoret of Cyr (ca. 435 C.E.) and the Alexandrian Cyril (ca. 425 C.E.). These commentaries follow the sequence of XII as an unfolding story, with prologues and summaries showing how the content and thrust (σκοπος and ὑπόθεσις) of each book contribute to the whole. The historical, spiritual and theological frameworks are largely determined by the Christian view of Old Testament prophecies as forerunners of Christ and the Church. Theodore of Mopsuestia, however, interprets them primarily within the history of Israel. The other commentators include historical explanations but much of the exegesis is conditioned by their Christian presuppositions. In Latin, Jerome also wrote commentaries on XII, but piecemeal, beginning with Micah ca. 393 and ending with Amos

in 406 C.E. Although aware of XII as a collection, he evidently felt no compulsion to work in strict canonical order. His commentaries are of considerable interest as he translates both Hebrew and Greek versions. He mainly uses the Hebrew for linguistic and historical exegesis and LXX for spiritual and allegorical applications (including attacks on Christian heretics and Jews). This approach often reduces the usefulness of his LXX comment. But there is much valuable information about the reasons for divergences between Hebrew and Greek; he preserves many Hexaplaric readings and also elements of contemporary Jewish exegesis, for some of which he is the sole source. See further *Bd'A* introductions; Simonetti, *Biblical Interpretation*.

Bibliography

- Barthélemy, D., *Critique Textuelle de l'Ancien Testament* (OBO 50.3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992).
- Bogaert, P.-M., 'L'organisation des grands recueils prophétiques', in J. Vermeylen (ed.), *The Book of Isaiah* (BETL 81; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989), pp. 147–53.
- Bons, E., J. Joosten and S. Kessler (eds.), *La Bible d'Alexandrie*. Vol. XXIII.1, *Les Douze Prophètes–Osée* (Paris: Cerf, 2002).
- Casevitz, M., C. Dogniez and M. Harl (eds.), *La Bible d'Alexandrie*. Vol. XXIII.10-11, *Les Douze Prophètes–Aggée, Zacharie* (Paris: Cerf, 2007).
- Collins, T., *The Mantle of Elijah: The Redaction Criticism of the Prophetic Books* (Biblical Seminar 20; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993).
- Dafni, E., 'ΠΑΝΤΟΚΡΑΤΩΡ in Septuaginta-Amos 4,13. Zur Theologie der Sprache der Septuaginta', in M.A. Knibb (ed.), *The Septuagint and Messianism* (BETL 195; Leuven: Peeters, 2006), pp. 443–54.
- Delamarter, S., *A Scripture Index to Charlesworth's The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002).
- Dines, J., 'The King's Good Servant? Loyalty, Subversion, and Greek Daniel', in T. Rajak, S. Pearce, J. Aitken and J. Dines (eds.), *Jewish Perspectives on Hellenistic Rulers* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007), pp. 205–24.
- The Septuagint* (UBW; London: T&T Clark International, 2004).
- 'The Septuagint of Amos: A Study in Interpretation' (Ph.D. dissertation, University of London, 1992).
- 'Stylistic Invention and Rhetorical Purpose in the Book of the Twelve', in E. Bons and T.J. Kraus (eds.), *Et Sapienter Et Eloquenter: Studies on Rhetorical and Stylistic Features of the Septuagint* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), pp. 23–48.

- ‘Verbal and Thematic Links between the Books of the Twelve in Greek and Their Relevance to the Differing Manuscript Sequences’, in R. Albertz, J.D. Nogalski and J. Wöhrle (eds.), *Perspectives on the Formation of the Book of the Twelve: Methodological Foundations—Redactional Processes—Historical Insights* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2012), pp. 355–70.
- Dogniez, C., ‘Le Dieu des armées dans le Dodekapropheton: quelques remarques sur une initiative de traduction’, in B. Taylor (ed.), *IX Congress of the International Organization of Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Cambridge 1995* (SCS 45; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), pp. 19–36.
- ‘Fautes de traduction ou bonnes traductions? Quelques exemples pris dans la LXX des Douze Petits Prophètes’, in B. Taylor (ed.), *X Congress of the International Organization of Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo 1998* (SBLSCS 51; Leiden: Brill, 2001), pp. 241–61.
- ‘L’Indépendance du traducteur grec d’Isaïe par rapport au Dodekapropheton’, in M.N. van der Meer *et al.* (eds.), *Isaiah in Context* (Festschrift A. van der Kooij; VTSup 136; Leiden: Brill, 2010), pp. 229–46.
- Ego, B., *et al.* (eds.), *Minor Prophets* (Biblia Qumranica 3B; Leiden: Brill, 2005).
- Glenney, W.E., *Finding Meaning in the Text: Translation Techniques and Theology in the Septuagint of Amos* (VTSup 126; Leiden: Brill, 2009).
- Harl, M., *et al.* (eds.), *La Bible d’Alexandrie. Vol. XXIII.4-9: Les Douze Prophètes—Joël, Abdiou, Jonas, Naoum, Ambakoum, Sophonie* (Paris: Cerf, 1999).
- Howard, G., ‘The Quinta of the Minor Prophets: A First Century Septuagint Text?’, *Bib* 55 (1974), pp. 15–22.
- Jeppesen, K., “‘The Lord God Has Spoken and Who Will Not Prophecy?’” From Osee to Jonas in the Septuagint’, in C. McCarthy and J.F. Healey (eds.), *Biblical and Near Eastern Essays* (Festschrift K.J. Cathcart; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2004), pp. 105–17.
- Jones, B., ‘The Book of the Twelve as a Witness to Ancient Biblical Interpretation’, in D. Nogalski and M.A. Sweeney (eds.), *Reading and Hearing the Book of the Twelve* (SBLSS 15; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000), pp. 65–74.
- The Formation of the Book of the Twelve: A Study in Text and Canon* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995).
- Knibb, M.A., (ed.), *The Septuagint and Messianism* (BETL 195; Leuven: Peeters, 2006).
- Kooij, A. van der, *The Oracle of Tyre: The Septuagint of Isaiah XXIII as Version and Vision* (Leiden: Brill, 1998).
- Kraus, W., and M. Karrer (eds.), *Septuaginta Deutsch: Das griechische Alte Testament in deutscher Übersetzung* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2009).
- Kraus, W., and R.G. Wooden (eds.), *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures* (SBLSCS 53; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006).
- McCarthy, C., and J. Healey (eds.), *Biblical and Near Eastern Essays* (Festschrift K. Cathcart; London: T&T Clark International, 2004).

- Munnich, O., 'Le messianisme à la lumière des livres prophétiques de la Bible grecque', in M.A. Knibb (ed.), *The Septuagint and Messianism* (BETL 195; Leuven: Peeters; 2006), pp. 327–55.
- Muraoka, T., 'Introduction aux douze petits prophètes', in E. Bons, J. Joosten and S. Kessler (eds.), *La Bible d'Alexandrie*. Vol. XXIII.1, *Les Douze Prophètes—Osée* (Paris: Cerf, 2002), pp. i–xxiii.
- Nogalski, J., *Redactional Processes in the Book of the Twelve* (BZAW 218; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1993).
- Nogalski, J., and M. Sweeney (eds.), *Reading and Hearing the Book of the Twelve* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000).
- Palmer, J., 'Not Made with Tracing Paper: Studies in the Septuagint of Zechariah' (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Cambridge, 2004).
- Redditt, P., and A. Scharf (eds.), *Thematic Threads in the Book of the Twelve* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003).
- Seeligmann, I.L., *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah: A Discussion of Its Problems* (Leiden: Brill, 1948).
- Simonetti, M., *Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1994).
- Sweeney, M., *Form and Intertextuality in Prophetic and Apocalyptic Literature* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005).
- Thackeray, H.St.J., 'The Greek Translators of the Prophetic Books', *JTS* 4 (1903), pp. 578–85.
- Tov, E., *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever (8HevXIIgr)* (DJD 8; Oxford: Clarendon, 1990).
- The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (2nd ed.; Jerusalem: Simor, 1997).
- Utzschneider, H., 'Flourishing Bones—The Minor Prophets in the New Testament', in W. Kraus and R.G. Wooden (eds.), *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), pp. 273–92.
- Vianès, L., *La Bible d'Alexandrie*. Vol. XXIII.12, *Les Douze Prophètes—Malachie* (Paris: Cerf, 2011).
- Vermeylen, J. (ed.), *The Book of Isaiah* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989).
- Zapf, B., 'The Perspective on the Nations in the Book of Micah', in P.L. Redditt and A. Scharf (eds.), *Thematic Threads in the Book of the Twelve* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003), pp. 292–312.
- Ziegler, J., 'Die Einheit der Septuaginta zum Zwölfprophetenbuch', *Beilage zum Vorlegungsverzeichnis der Staatl. Akademie zu Braunsberg/Ostpr.* (1934/5), pp. 1–16 (repr. in *Sylloge: Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Septuaginta* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971], pp. 29–42).
- Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum*. Vol. XIII, *Duodecim Prophetarum* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984 repr. [1943]).

Isaiah

Abi T. Ngunga and Joachim Schaper

Editions

(a) Standard Greek Editions

Göttingen, vol. XIV, *Isaias* (Ziegler, 1967 repr.)

Rahlfs-Hanhart, vol. II, pp. 566–655.¹

Swete, vol. III, pp. 101–222.

(b) Other Greek Editions

The Book of Isaiah (2 vols.; Ottley, 1904).²

(c) Modern Translations

NETS (Silva, 2007), pp. 823–75.

LXX.D (Van der Kooij *et al.*, 2009), pp. 1231–86.

1. Rahlfs-Hanhart and Göttingen differ in a few places, and though many variations are relatively minor, close scrutiny of every case against its literary context is encouraged, as it could lead to significant results. For example, in Isa. 42.4 Rahlfs-Hanhart reads τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ (for תורתו) vs. Göttingen's τῷ νόμῳ αὐτοῦ; Ngunga has demonstrated that the difference between the two could have implications with regard to the question whether traces of messianism among the Jewish community in Alexandria can be detected (*Messianism*, pp. 167–72).

2. Ottley admits his edition is intended more for general reading than for textual study; as a result, A is not printed with total precision, and the edition contains a few readings that are not found in A. However, his intention in introducing them was ‘to show in the footnotes the rejected readings of A in all such cases, except in the matter of common errors or varieties of spelling, and itacisms of the usual kind’ (*Book of Isaiah*, vol. 2, p. xiv).

(d) Additional Comments

Vaticanus (B), the oldest manuscript of the Greek Bible, was used as the basis for Swete's edition of the LXX. Introducing the third volume (which includes the LXX of Isaiah) in 1894, Swete refers to '[t]he great Vatican MS., whose text and order we have generally followed' (*OTG* 3, p. v). However, a few years later, he impugned the quality of B with regard to Isaiah (*Introduction*, pp. 487–88), and it is important to note that B of Isaiah contains Hexaplaric readings. As a result, Alexandrinus (A) has been considered as preserving best the text of the OG of Isaiah, and it was used as the basis for Ottley's edition.

I. General Characteristics

The LXX of Isaiah is one of the most fascinating books in the LXX. Its distinctive features have inspired important exegetical work and will continue to draw a significant amount of scholarly interest. It is written in a literary style that is more accomplished than most LXX books and it varies its translation equivalents and syntax frequently. Additions to or modifications of the Hebrew parent text are likely in many cases, and this raises the possibility that the translator was conveying his own theological or political position in the translation. For some, therefore, the translator was actualising the prophecies for the community of his own time (Van der Kooij, *Oracle of Tyre*; 'The Septuagint of Isaiah'), while for others he was merely a careful if not creative reader of the Hebrew (Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*). The position taken on the nature of the translation affects how far one can read ideological tendencies into the translation and its status within the Jewish community of Egypt (see § VI).

II. Time and Place of Composition

The book of Isaiah was translated in Egypt (most probably in Alexandria), which can be deduced from the type of Greek used by the translator, vocabulary specific to Hellenistic Egypt (see § III) and allusions to events in the history of Ptolemaic Egypt (Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, pp. 70–94). To name just one example, divine names and theological and mythological terms in the Hebrew original were adapted and 'enculturated' by the translator (cf. Schaper, 'God and the Gods'). Ideological tendencies and beliefs could support a setting in Egypt, but

much is dependent on the degree to which the older prophecies are seen as having been actualised in the translation (see § VI). Vocabulary and the use of Egyptian terms are the surer indicators of location.

No firm date can be offered, but the consensus places the work sometime in the second century B.C.E. Apparent dependency on and familiarity with not only the LXX Pentateuch but also the translations of Jeremiah, Ezekiel and the Minor Prophets suggests it is later in the translation process than some of the prophets (as could be implied by the ‘freer’ translation style, too). It is usually assumed it was completed before the translator’s preface to Sirach was written (ca. 132 or 117 B.C.E.). The allusion to the destruction of Carthage (146 B.C.E.) in the translation at 23.14 would suggest a date ca. 145 B.C.E (Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version*) or ca. 140 (Van der Kooij, *Oracle of Tyre*, pp. 76–87). An anti-Hasmonean stance of the post-Maccabean period has also been noted in the translation, with the Greek supporting the legitimacy of the Oniad temple at Leontopolis (Isa. 10.24; 19.19; cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 13.68). This would conform to a late second-century date (see further Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version*, p. 86).

III. Language

The language used by the Isaiah translator displays a number of vocabulary and syntactic features that reflect good Koine Greek of the second century B.C.E. (Thackeray, *Grammar*, p. 13; Seeligmann, *The Septuagint Version*, pp. 184–85; Van der Louw, *Transformations*, p. 155). This type of Greek is also known to us from a growing number of the contemporary Ptolemaic-period inscriptions and papyri being published (Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, pp. 197–201; Van der Meer, ‘Trendy Translations’). For example, an expression which may seem to be a neologism coined by our translator may in fact be attested in the Koine Greek of papyri. This can be inferred from Ziegler’s study of various papyri. He has shown that our translator, for example, did not invent the term ὑπομνηματογράφος ‘recorder’ for מזכיר (in Isa. 36.3, 22), as LEH (p. 494) seems to suggest. This term is rather, as Muraoka has pointed out, the title of ‘the corresponding official in the [royal] office of the minister of finance’ (GELS, 704b; cf. LSJ, 1889b; Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*, p. 201).

However, some scholars have also discovered other characteristics which indicate that the aforementioned Koine Greek in the LXX Isaiah was not exempt from interferences of Semitic languages (Hebrew and Aramaic) in its vocabulary, syntax and style (Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version*, pp. 67–69, 194–95; Tov, *Greek and Hebrew*, pp. 165–82; Joosten, ‘Biblical Hebrew’; cf. *BGS*, pp. 224–25, 260–62). Others have even identified the influence of Arabic (Driver, ‘Supposed Arabisms’; Jellicoe, *Septuagint*, p. 325). More recently, Léonas has argued that, although the hypothesis of an influence of Arabic is not impossible, it seems that it is more appropriate to speak of an Aramaic interference since the majority of roots of Arabic words are also attested in Aramaic (*L’Aube*, p. 86 n. 1). However, each given case should be studied in greater detail (i.e., not in isolation, but in its literary context), as such an enterprise can sometimes produce extraordinary results. For instance, it has been suggested that the use of φρονεῖν (for רעײ) in Isa. 44.28 reflects the Aramaic reading רעײ/רעא ‘to think’ (*L’Aube*, p. 87). A careful analysis of this verse (in the light of Isa. 45.1) reveals that the MT’s reading of Cyrus as ‘the shepherd of the Lord’ (44.28) was replaced in the Greek text by ‘the Lord telling him [i.e. Cyrus] to think’ (ὁ λέγων Κύρω φρονεῖν). For according to our translator, Cyrus (in 45.1) is not a figure to whom the Lord speaks as ‘his [i.e. the Lord’s] anointed’ (למשיחו), but as one whose name is ‘my anointed’ (τῷ χριστῷ μου Κύρω). In this way, our translator understood that Cyrus as a pagan was *not used* by the Lord for the redemption of Israel; but rather he was *created* by the Lord. For even the MT’s reference (in 48.14) to God’s love (יהוה אהבו) for Cyrus is transferred to ‘Israel’ (ἀγαπῶν σε). It is this love that becomes the reason for the Lord’s redemptive action (see Ngunga, *Messianism*, p. 204).

The conclusion from the example above raises the question of the nature and extent of the aforementioned Semitic influences on the LXX Isaiah. It also lends support to the view that there are multiple motivations for the Isaiah translator’s choice of lexemes. These include contextual sensitivity, lexical rearrangements due to a scarcity of suitable Greek equivalents to some Hebrew terms and an interest in producing a coherent text in good Koine Greek. The translator’s aim of establishing

coherence is one of the areas of interest of Van der Kooij (see bibliography). That establishing coherence was in fact the translator's aim can be demonstrated on the basis of his use of particles (e.g., οὖν, δέ, γάρ, etc.), which has been investigated by Le Moigne ('Le Livre d'Ésaïe'). His choices also reveal his strategy in creating intertextual links within the overall literary unit, his dependence—in some cases—on an existing pattern laid down in the LXX-Pentateuch, and so on. However, there are also a few lexemes with semantic nuances similar to those contained in the matching words from the Hebrew parent text (cf. Van der Louw, *Transformations*, pp. 236–37). This leads us to other issues pertinent to our understanding of the main features displayed in the book before us.

IV. Translation and Composition

The past scholarly labours on the LXX Isaiah have classified this text as a relatively 'free', rather than 'literal', translation. The 'free' renderings by our translator include a significant number of pluses, minuses, lexical choices, variants, neologisms, liberties in word order, and so on. However, scholars have struggled to try to provide plausible factors which might be behind the differences between the Greek text and its Hebrew *Vorlage*. For it should be borne in mind that 'it is often exceedingly difficult to decide to which Hebrew elements the Greek words correspond' (Joosten, 'Reflections', p. 177). More recently, Troxel has provided an important chronological survey of scholars' opinions related to this issue (*LXX-Isaiah*, pp. 4–19). In his review, we read that this scholarly struggle goes back as far as 1880, the year in which Scholz's thesis, which recognises the presence of both the Isaiah translator's literal renderings of his parent text and a few deviations (in some passages), was published (*Die alexandrinische Übersetzung*, pp. 14, 44–45). The issue was subsequently either dealt with or echoed in 1902 (Swete, *Intro.*; Liebmann, 'Der Text'; Zillesen, 'Bermerkungen'), 1904 (Ottley, *Book of Isaiah*), 1927 (Wutz, *Die Transkriptionen*), 1930 (Fischer, *In welcher Schrift*), 1934 (Ziegler, *Untersuchungen*) and 1948 (Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version*). The work of the last two scholars and that of Ottley was assessed by Van der Kooij ('Isaiah in the Septuagint'). He demonstrates that, from 1948 onwards, the majority of scholars (including Van der Kooij himself) working on LXX Isaiah have mainly

been building on the legacies left by these three figures (Ottley, Ziegler, and Seeligmann). Their discussions centre on the value of the apparent divergences in the LXX version and how far they are to be attributed to an interpretative intention on the part of the translator.

As we explore some of the suggested factors which might be the *raison d'être* of our translator's 'free' renderings, it should not be forgotten that 'a translation can be literal and free at the same time in different modes or on different levels' (Barr, *Typology*, p. 6). Indeed, LXX Isaiah reflects both types of translation, though the features of a 'free' version are dominant. In this connection, it has been argued that 'free' renditions (in a LXX book like Isaiah) appear more frequently 'in the lyric and prophetic passages' (Ottley, *Handbook*, p. 111). In contrast, 'when a piece of narrative is introduced among prophecies, as in Isa. xxxix, the translation at once becomes closer and clearer' (Ottley, *Handbook*, p. 111). However, while this can sometimes be the case, any investigator of a given passage (be it narrative or prophetic) of LXX Isaiah should carefully weigh every single element of that passage, be it major or minor. In doing so, one will be able to see that the translation can contain subtle shades of meaning, sometimes giving additional emphasis to aspects already present in the *Vorlage*, sometimes creating new meanings.

The following factors can be added to those already discussed above (i.e., the translator's aim to enhance the coherence of his text and produce a good Koine Greek, his use of intertextuality and the transformations due to Semitic interferences). First, the majority of the differences between the Greek and Hebrew texts of Isaiah are mainly due to issues related to the translator's failures in reading the Hebrew underlying his Greek text (Ottley, *Book of Isaiah*, vol. I, p. 50). An example pertinent to this is the translation of בְּיַבֵּשׁ 'in a dry place' by ἐν Σίῳν 'in Zion' (in Isa. 32.2, also 25.5). The first impression one gets here is that the rendering of Σίῳν seems to reflect a lexical confusion in the sense that the translator may have read יִצְיִן (instead of יִצְיָן ; Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, p. 190). However, an enquiry into the translator's use of Σίῳν (for יִצְיִן) in these passages reveals that Σίῳν fits perfectly well with the flow of thought in each pericope read in their literary context (cf. Ngunga, *Messianism*, p. 154). This would lead to the conclusion that the translator consciously opted for the rendering of Σίῳν . It is essential that each case

be investigated in great detail and an atomistic approach towards any single term or phrase be avoided (further examples are in Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version*, pp. 204–205; Tov, *Text-Critical*, pp. 111, 113, 137–39).

Secondly, grammatical and stylistic reasons may have been behind the ‘free’ renderings produced by the translator (Joosten, ‘Reflections’, p. 174). Strikingly, these sometimes show the translator’s homiletical intentions (Baer, *When We All Go Home*, pp. 17, 278, esp. his chs. 2–3). Unfortunately, little scholarly attention has so far been given to this aspect (Joosten, ‘Reflections’, p. 174). Thirdly, there is the translator’s way of ‘actualising’ of prophecies.³ Last but not least, differences between the Hebrew and Greek texts of Isaiah may sometimes be due to the translator’s use of neologisms mentioned above. Besides what we said earlier, the neologisms present in LXX Isaiah (e.g., ἐνωτίζομαι ‘give ear, hearken to’ in 1.2; ὄλοκαύτωμα ‘burnt-offering’ in 1.11; 56.7; ὄλοκαύτωσις ‘sacrifice of a burnt-offering’ in 40.16; 43.25; θυσιαστήριον ‘altar’ in 6.6; 19.19; 60.7; βωμός ‘altar’ in 15.2; 16.12; 17.8; etc.) are too often viewed as taken over from the LXX Pentateuch—should that indeed have been the case, the terms were used by the Isaiah translator either with caution or for a specific purpose that suited his context.

V. Key Text-Critical Issues

As is the case with other LXX books, there are intriguing and difficult issues that arise when trying to reconstruct the original text of LXX Isaiah (examples in Tov, *Text-Critical*, pp. 13–14, 17–18; Jobses and Silva, *Invitation*, pp. 120–43; Ottley, *Handbook*, pp. 81–100). These consist of assessing the evidence provided by the numerous manuscripts witnessing to the text, the later Greek translations (Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion) and recensions (Hexaplaric and Lucianic), the secondary versions (mainly the Vulgate and Old Latin, the Syriac and Coptic versions),⁴ Hellenistic Jewish authors (Philo, Josephus), the early

3. Examples of this aspect can be found in the relevant works of Seeligmann and Van der Kooij; see also Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah*, who discusses it under the title “‘Contemporizing’ Interpretation” (pp. 152–72).

4. There are some MSS of translations into other languages which have survived, including Arabic, Armenian, Georgian, Gothic, Ethiopic and Slavonic.

patristic writers (including especially Irenaeus, Tertullian, Cyprian) and the quotations in the New Testament. It seems that there is no straightforward methodological approach as even some of the helpful rules laid down by Lagarde require great caution when applied (Ottley, *Handbook*, pp. 93–94). However, in general, any decision as to which Greek reading should be considered as being closest to the original depends on the assessment of both the internal and the external evidence. With regard to the latter, one needs to take into account issues (including the quantity, quality and age of the MSS) relating to the reliability of the individual witnesses, without excluding the possibility that sometimes a correct reading is found only in a very few MSS (Ottley, *Handbook*, p. 94). The decision-making also involves paying careful attention to the weight of the identified and compared families of related witnesses.

Evaluating the internal evidence necessitates an understanding of the text in its broader literary context and of the translator's style and thought (including his chief methods for resolving difficulties he encountered). The task requires giving preference to variants which conform to the aspirations of the community to which the translator himself belongs, as well as to the more difficult or shorter reading. In the case of Isaiah this is particularly problematic, and reconstruction of the *Vorlage* must take into account the literary nature of the translation. The freer translation style does not necessarily mean a plus in the LXX in relation to the MT represents a differing *Vorlage*. Lexical variation in the Greek also does not necessarily amount to differing words in the Hebrew. The ideology and exegetical tendencies of this translator must be taken into account before decisions on the textual reconstruction of the Hebrew can be taken (Van der Kooij, *Oracle of Tyre*).

One of the benefits of the difficult enterprise of textual-critical analysis (as outlined above, without a claim to comprehensiveness) is, as Van der Louw has correctly said, that it forces the student of a given text to 'explain more precisely which "free" renderings result from linguistic demands and which are the result of the translator's exegesis' (Van der Louw, *Transformations*, p. 9).

VI. Ideology and Exegesis

LXX Isaiah contains a significant number of instances that display the translator's theological and exegetical motives. Theological concepts and exegetical practices are among the factors leading to the translator's 'free' renderings discussed above.

Interest in the problem has significantly increased since 1934, the year in which both J. Ziegler (*Untersuchungen*) and K.F. Euler (*Die Verkündigung*) noted the presence of 'theological' features within LXX Isaiah. These were also subsequently identified in the work of many other scholars, including I.L. Seeligmann, J.W. Olley, P. Grelot, J. Koenig, A. van der Kooj, R.L. Troxel, E.R. Ekblad, D.A. Baer, E. Tov, J. Schaper, P. Le Moigne and many more. Data concerning their work are provided in the bibliography.

In order to give a 'flavour' of features of LXX Isaiah which are characteristic in this respect, a fine example is discussed by Le Moigne ('οὐχ ὡς dans Ésaïe-LXX'). He investigates οὐχ ὡς as an expression that occurs only five times in LXX Isaiah as a whole (8.14, 20; 29.16; 54.6, 16). One of his striking discoveries is that our translator displays exceptional talent as a writer in the service of a particular theology ('met au service d'une théologie spécifique un exceptionnel talent d'écrivain'; Le Moigne 'οὐχ ὡς', p. 103)—for in each of these passages, the Greek text displays a different image of God and his relationship with Israel. For instance, Le Moigne discovers that Isa. 8.14 in MT is a passage that speaks of God in somewhat severe terms, as God will become a stumbling block ('deviendra une pierre d'achoppement et un rocher de chute'). The Isaiah translator, as observes Le Moigne, seems to have difficulty accepting this idea, and in a manner similar to the targum produces a reverse translation: no, God will not appear to his people as a stumbling block or a tripping stone ('non, Dieu ne se manifestera au peuple ni comme l'obstacle d'une pierre ni comme la chute provoquée par un caillou: οὐχ ὡς λίθου προσκόμματι συναντήσεσθε αὐτῷ οὐδὲ ὡς πέτρας πτώματι'). For Le Moigne the harsh nature of the expression is thus ameliorated in an economic fashion ('οὐχ ὡς', p. 103).

Themes that have been investigated and/or are yet to be explored include the Isaiah translator's perception of the concepts of God, his messiah, salvation, glory, righteousness, eschatology, Zion, exile,

repentance, the spirit of the Lord, Israel, Torah, etc. LXX Isaiah contains a wealth of concepts and a rich terminology which are important areas for future research.

VII. Reception History

The key to understanding the book's reception history is to appreciate its Hellenistic Jewish messianic 'flavour' (Ngunga, *Messianism, contra de Sousa, Eschatology*). The Greek Isaiah is permeated by renderings of the Hebrew that are heavily coloured by contemporary messianic concepts, and it is precisely these renderings which contributed much to the further development of messianic and eschatological thought in Hellenistic and Roman-period Judaism and in the early Church. The appropriation of the Old Greek version of Isa. 7.14 in Mt. 1.23 and, less explicitly, in Lk. 1.26-27, as opposed to staying closer to the Hebrew original, had a very significant impact on the perception of Mary and on the messianic interpretation of the person of Jesus, and this is only the most famous of all the Isaianic passages which have received a messianic interpretation at the hands of the translator. This and other key passages of the Greek Isaiah, especially the 'Servant Songs', had a significant impact, particularly on early Christian thought (cf. especially Moyise and Menken, *Isaiah*).

Bibliography

- Baer, D.A., *When We All Go Home: Translation and Theology in LXX Isaiah 56–66* (JSOTSup 318; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001).
- Barr, J., *The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations* (MSU 15; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979).
- Collins, J.J., 'Isaiah 8:23–9:6 and Its Greek Translation', in A. Voitila and J. Jokiranta (eds.), *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls* (Festschrift R. Sollamo; Leiden: Brill, 2008), pp. 205–21.
- Daniel, S., *Recherches sur le vocabulaire du culte dans la Septante* (Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1966).
- Driver, G.R., 'Supposed Arabisms in the Old Testament', *JBL* 55 (1936), pp. 101–20.
- Ekblad, E.R., *Isaiah's Servant Poems according to the Septuagint: An Exegetical and Theological Study* (CBET 23; Leuven: Peeters, 1999).
- Euler, K.F., *Die Verkündigung vom leidenden Gottesknecht aus Jes 53 in der griechischen Bibel* (BWANT 66; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1934).

The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint

- Fischer, J., *In welcher Schrift lag das Buch Isaias den LXX vor?* (Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1930).
- Grelot, P., *Les Poèmes du Serviteur: De la lecture critique à l'herméneutique* (Lectio Divina 130; Paris: Cerf, 1981).
- Hanhart, R., 'Die Septuaginta als Interpretation und Aktualisierung: Jesaja 9:1(8:23)-7(6)', in A. Rofé and Y. Zakovitch (eds.), *Isaac Leo Seeligmann Volume* (Essays on the Bible and the Ancient World 3; Jerusalem: E. Rubinstein, 1983), pp. 331–46.
- Jellicoe, S., *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1993).
- Jobes, K.H., and M. Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2000).
- Joosten, J., 'Biblical Hebrew as Mirrored in the Septuagint: The Question of Influence from Spoken Hebrew', *Textus* 21 (2002), pp. 1–19.
- 'Reflections on the "Interlinear Paradigm" in Septuagint Studies', in A. Voitila and J. Jokiranta (eds.), *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls* (Festschrift R. Sollamo; Leiden: Brill, 2008), pp. 171–95.
- Kabiersch, J., A. van der Kooij, K. Koenen, F. Wilk, in collaboration with K. Baltzer, 'Esaia/Das Buch Jesaja', in W. Kraus and M. Karrer (eds.), *Septuaginta deutsch: Das griechische Alte Testament in deutscher Übersetzung* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2009–10), pp. 1230–86.
- Kooij, A. van der, 'Accident or Method? On "Analogical" Interpretation in the Old Greek of Isaiah and in 1QIs^a', *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 43 (1986), pp. 366–75.
- Die alten Textzeugen des Jesajabuches: Ein Beitrag zur Textgeschichte des Alten Testaments* (OBO 35; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981).
- 'Interpretation of the Book of Isaiah in the Septuagint and in other Ancient Versions', in C.M. McGinnis and P.K. Tull (eds.), *'As Those Who Are Thought': The Interpretation of Isaiah from the LXX to the SBL* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), pp. 49–68.
- 'Isaiah in the Septuagint', in C.G. Broyles and C.A. Evans (eds.), *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition*, vol. II (VTSup 70; Leiden: Brill, 1997), pp. 513–30.
- The Oracle of Tyre: The Septuagint of Isaiah XXII as Version and Vision* (Leiden: Brill, 1998).
- 'The Septuagint of Isaiah and the Mode of Reading Prophecies in Early Judaism: Some Comments on LXX Isaiah 8–9', in M. Karrer and W. Kraus (eds.), *Die Septuaginta—Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten* (WUNT 219; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), pp. 597–611.
- 'The Septuagint of Isaiah: Translation and Interpretation', in J. Vermeylen (ed.), *The Book of Isaiah/Le livre d'Isaïe: Les oracles et leurs relectures. Unité et complexité de l'ouvrage* (BETL 131; Leuven: Peeters, 1989), pp. 127–33.
- 'Zur Theologie des Jesajabuches in der Septuaginta', in H.G. Reventlow (ed.), *Theologische Probleme der Septuaginta und der hellenistischen Hermeneutik* (Gütersloh: Christian Kaiser, 1997), pp. 9–25.

- Kooij, A. van der, and M.N. van der Meer (eds.), *The Old Greek of Isaiah: Issues and Perspectives* (CBET 55; Leuven: Peeters, 2010).
- Laberge, L., *La Septante d'Isaïe 28–33: Etude de Traduction Textuelle* (Ottawa: Centre de Recherche de l'Université Saint-Paul, 1978).
- Le Moigne, P., 'ὄχι ὡς dans Ésaïe-LXX', in J. Joosten and P. Le Moigne (eds.), *L'apport de la Septante aux études sur l'Antiquité* (Paris: Cerf, 2005), pp. 71–104.
- 'Le Livre d'Ésaïe dans la Septante: ecdotique, stylistique, linguistique ou esquisse d'une poétique de la Septante' (Ph.D. dissertation, École pratique des Hautes Études, 2001).
- Léonas, A., *L'Aube des traducteurs. De l'hébreu au grec: traducteurs et lecteurs de la Bible des Septante III^e S. av. J.-C.–IV^e S. apr. J.-C* (Paris: Cerf, 2007).
- Liebmann, E., 'Der Text zu Jesaja 24–27', *ZAW* 22 (1902), pp. 1–56.
- Louw, T. A. W. van der, *Transformations in the Septuagint* (Leuven: Peeters, 2007).
- Meer, M.N. van der, 'Trendy Translations in the Septuagint of Isaiah: A Study of the Vocabulary of the Greek Isaiah 3, 18-23 in the Light of Contemporary Sources', in M. Karrer and W. Kraus (eds.), *Die Septuaginta—Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten* (WUNT 219; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), pp. 581–96.
- Moyise, S., and M.J.J. Menken, *Isaiah in the New Testament* (The New Testament and the Scriptures of Israel; London: T&T Clark International, 2005).
- Munnich, O., 'Le texte lucianique d'Isaïe-Septante', in F. García Martínez and M. Vervenne (eds.), *Interpreting Translation: Studies on the LXX and Ezekiel* (Festschrift J. Lust; BETL 192; Leuven: Peeters, 2005), pp. 269–99.
- 'La traduction grecque d'Isaïe 8–9 et ses liens avec l'exégèse rabbinique', *Adamantius* 13 (2007), pp. 8–19.
- Ngunga, A.T., *Messianism in the Old Greek of Isaiah: An Intertextual Analysis* (FRLANT 245; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013).
- Olley, J.W., 'Righteousness' in the Septuagint of Isaiah: A Contextual Study (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979).
- Ottley, R.R., *The Book of Isaiah according to the LXX (Codex Alexandrinus)* (2 vols.; London: Cambridge University Press, 1904).
- A Handbook to the Septuagint* (London: Methuen, 1920).
- Porter, S.E., and B.W.R. Pearson, 'Isaiah through Greek Eyes: The Septuagint of Isaiah', in C.G. Broyles and C.A. Evans (eds.), *Writing and Reading the Scroll of Isaiah: Studies of an Interpretive Tradition* (VTSup 70/1; Leiden: Brill, 1997), pp. 531–46.
- Rösel, M., 'Die Jungfrauengeburt des endzeitlichen Immanuel', *JBTh* 6 (1991), pp. 135–51.
- Salvesen, A., 'Messianism in Ancient Bible Translation in Greek and Latin', in M. Bockmuehl and J. Carleton Paget (eds.), *Redemption and Resistance: The Messianic Hopes of Jews and Christians in Antiquity* (London: T&T Clark International, 2007), pp. 245–61.
- Schaper, J., 'God and the Gods: Pagan Deities and Religious Concepts in the Greek Isaiah', in K.J. Dell, G.I. Davies and Y.V. Koh (eds.), *Genesis, Isaiah and Psalms* (Festschrift J. Emerton; VTSup 135; Leiden: Brill, 2010), pp. 135–52.

The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint

- ‘Messianism in the Septuagint of Isaiah and Messianic Intertextuality in the Greek Bible’, in M.A. Knibb (ed.), *The Septuagint and Messianism* (BETL 195; Leuven: Peeters, 2006), pp. 371–80.
- Scholz, A., *Die alexandrinische Übersetzung des Buches Jesaias* (Würzburg: L. Woerl, 1880).
- Seeligmann, I.L., *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah: A Discussion of Its Problems* (Ex Oriente Lux; Leiden: Brill, 1948) [repr. in R. Hanhart and H. Spieckermann (eds.), *The Septuagint Version of Isaiah and Cognate Studies* (FAT 40; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), pp. 119–294].
- Silva, M., ‘Esaias’, in A. Pieterma and B.G. Wright (eds.), *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), pp. 823–75.
- Sousa, R.F. de, *Eschatology and Messianism in LXX Isaiah 1–12* (LHBOTS 516; New York: T&T Clark International, 2010).
- Tov, E., *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (SVT 72; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1999).
- The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (JBS 8; Jerusalem: Simor, 1997).
- Troxel, R.L., ‘Economic Plunder as a Leitmotif in LXX-Isaiah’, *Bib* 83 (2002), pp. 375–91.
- ‘Exegesis and Theology in the LXX—Isaiah 5:26-30’, *VT* 43 (1993), pp. 102–11.
- LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation: The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah* (Leiden: Brill, 2008).
- ‘What’s in a Name? Contemporization and Toponyms in LXX-Isaiah’, in R.L. Troxel, et al. (eds.), *Seeking Out the Wisdom of the Ancients* (Festschrift M.V. Fox; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2005), pp. 327–44.
- Wutz, F., *Die Transkriptionen von der Septuaginta bis zu Hieronymus* (Texte und Untersuchungen zur vormasoretischen Grammatik des Hebräischen 2; Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1927).
- Ziegler, J. *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaiaes* (ATAbH 12.3; Münster: AschendorffschenVerlagsbuchhandlung, 1934).
- Ziegler, J. (ed.), *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum*. Vol. XIV, *Isaias* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967 repr. [1939]).
- Zillesen, A., ‘Bemerkungen zur alexandrinischen Übersetzung des Jesaja (c. 40–66)’, *ZAW* 22 (1902), pp. 238–63.

Jeremiah

Andrew G. Shead

Editions

(a) Standard Greek Editions

Göttingen, vol. XV, *Ieremias, Baruch, Threni, Epistula Ieremiae* (Ziegler, 1976; 2nd ed.).¹

Rahlfs-Hanhart, vol. II, pp. 656–747.

Swete, vol. III, pp. 223–350.

(b) Other Greek Editions

Das Buch Jeremia (Nestle, 1924).²

Ieremias Vates e versione Iudaeorum Alexandrinorum (Spohn, 1824).

Vetus Testamentum Graecum (Holmes and Parsons, 1798).

(c) Modern Translations

NETS (Pietersma and Saunders, 2007), pp. 876–924.

LXX.D (Fischer and Vonach, 2009), pp. 1288–1342.

I. General Characteristics

Two features of LXX Jeremiah have dominated scholarship. The first, noted since Origen, is its divergence in length and internal order from the MT (§ V). The second is the evidence of more than one translator's hand in the text, as noted by Spohn (*Ieremias*, pp. 9–10).

1. Ziegler's edition has stood up to careful scrutiny (Soderlund, *Greek Text*). Although it is slightly too 'tidy' (e.g., in the consistency with which articles, conjunctions and prepositions are represented), and marked by the occasional conjectural emendation, this is unavoidable, and Ziegler's work is unlikely to be surpassed for many years to come.

2. Nestle's text is a modestly edited version of Vaticanus with Hexaplaric signs, a critical apparatus and a parallel Hebrew text. The apparatus is a noteworthy attempt to group readings, drawn from the major codices, uncials, ancient revisions, citations, and daughter versions.

a. Versification

The differences between the Septuagint and MT of Jeremiah (§ V) create different chapter and verse numbering for much of the book. Even the Greek editions are not consistent, with the system of the Sixtine edition being modified by Rahlfs, and again by Ziegler. Table 1 shows how Ziegler’s system [Z] corresponds to that of Rahlfs [R] and the Hebrew text [MT] respectively. Extra whole verses in the Hebrew (so-called pluses) are added in brackets. Shorter pluses that do not affect versification have been ignored. The published Greek editions leave gaps in their versification to accommodate these pluses, with the exception of Jer. 34.1-18[Z]. In this discussion all Jeremiah references follow the Ziegler edition, even when discussing the Hebrew text.

Table 1. Versification in Ziegler, Rahlfs and MT Jeremiah.

LXX [Z]	LXX [R]	Hebrew [MT] [+ vv. not in LXX]
1.1–8.22	1.1–8.22	1.1–8.22 [+2.1; 7.1, 27; 8.11-12]
9.1–26	8.23–9.25	9.1-26
10.1–25.13*	10.1–25.13*	10.1–25.13a*
25.14-19	25.14-19	49.34-39
26.1	25.20	49.34?
26.2-28	26.2-28	46.2-28 [+ vv. 1, 26]
27.1-46	27.1-46	50.1-46
28.1-64	28.1-64	51.1-64 [+ vv. 45-48]
29.1-7	29.1-7	47.1-7
29.8-23	30.1-16	49.7-22
30.1-5	30.17-21	49.1-5 [+ v. 6]
30.6-11	30.23-28	49.28-33
30.12-16	30.29-33	49.23-27
31.1-44	31.1-44	48.1-44 [+ vv. 45-47]
—	32.13	25.13b
32.1-24	32.15-38	25.15-38 [+ v. 14]
33.1-24	33.1-24	26.1-24
34.1-18	34.2-22	27.2-22 [+ vv. 1, 7, 13, 17, 21]
35.1–51.30	35.1–51.30	28.1–44.30**
51.31-35	51.31-35	45.1-5
52.1-34	52.1-34	52.1-34 [+ vv. 2-3, 15, 28-30]

*Jer. 10.5a[Z] = Jer. 10.9a[R]; MT has pluses at 10.6-8, 10; 11.7; 17.1-4.

**MT has pluses at [Z]36.16-20; 37.10-11, 15, 22; 40.14-26; 46.4-13.

b. The Two-Translator Question

Two influential studies of the Jeremiah translator had until recently commanded almost universal consensus. Thackeray ('Notes and Studies') argued for two translators, one (labelled 'Jeremiah α ') responsible for chs. 1–28 as well as for Ezekiel and the Minor Prophets, and the other ('Jeremiah β ') for chs. 29–51 as well as Bar. 1.1–3.8. The clearest evidence for this is the Hebrew messenger formula: כה אמר יהוה, 'thus says Yhwh', rendered by τὰδε λέγει κύριος in chs. 1–28 (and in the other Prophets), but rendered οὕτως εἶπεν κύριος in chs. 30–51. Jeremiah 29 mixes the two, but Thackeray assigned it to Jeremiah β on the basis of a study of 27 further cases of distinct renderings in the two halves of Jeremiah. He suggested ch. 52 was the work of a third translator ('Jeremiah γ '). He found corroboration in the Greek style of Jeremiah α (described as 'indifferent Greek' along with Ezekiel and the 12 prophets) in contrast to Jeremiah β ('literal or unintelligent', along with Bar. 1.1–3.8; *Grammar*, p. 13). Signs of this 'unintelligence' included the number of transcriptions, *hapax legomena* and false etymologies (by which a Greek meaning is extracted from the sound of the Hebrew; *Grammar* p. 37).

Thackeray's thesis was modified by Tov (*Septuagint Translation*), developing Ziegler's suggestion (*Ieremias*, p. 128 n. 1) that the second translator might be a reviser who had reworked one part of the book. Drawing attention to 45 renditions common to Jeremiah α and β but rare or absent from the rest of the LXX, Tov concluded that these are best explained as the work of the original translator, whose so-called Old Greek (OG) translation is also visible in Bar. 1.1–3.8. The differences between Thackeray's Jeremiah α and β (to which Tov himself added many further examples) could have resulted from a revision of Jeremiah LXX, preserved only in the second half of the book. Most of the reviser's choices Tov characterised as more precise, correct, literal, or consistent reflections of the Hebrew (*Septuagint Translation*, p. 43). He was unconvinced of the existence of Thackeray's Jeremiah γ .

Since the 1990s, however, this hypothesis has been questioned. First, the mixed nature of Jeremiah 29 is hard to square with an abrupt transition from an unrevised to a revised text. Secondly, the renditions peculiar to Jeremiah β are hard to reconcile with any suggested motive on the part of a reviser (Stipp, 'Offene'). Thirdly, there are inconsistencies

within each half of the book that call for an inductive study of the problem—a special relationship between Jeremiah α and β may have been found because we were looking to find it (Michael, ‘Bisectioning’). Accordingly, Pietersma (‘Excursus’) tackles the major difference, namely the rendering of the messenger formula, by suggesting that its unusual translation in Jeremiah 29–51 is not a free variant, but refers to a speech act that is now past. This is in keeping with the second half of the book in which the prophet preaches the divine word, ‘harking back to past oracles as appropriate’ (‘Excursus’, p. 8; see also Becking, ‘Jeremiah’s Book’, pp. 147–48).

While not dealing a decisive blow to the Thackeray–Tov hypothesis (and leaving unaccounted Thackeray’s observations on the style of the Greek), these recent studies have reopened the question. Since the main differences between Jeremiah α and β concern lexical choices, it is still possible to comment on the Greek style and translation technique of the book as a whole. In short, the book is carefully translated without being ‘slavishly’ literal. It is generally isomorphic (representing each Hebrew morpheme by a Greek word), and adheres closely to the source text, often at the expense of idiomatic Greek, but without complete lexical or grammatical consistency. Most cases of free translation serve the interests of accuracy, and may be broadly classified as exegetical. In general there is sensitivity to the underlying Hebrew discourse, and while the translator’s theological convictions occasionally show through, the translation as a whole is restrained in its use of theologically motivated renderings.

II. Time and Place of Composition

The use of Jeremiah by Sirach’s grandson (Ziegler, *Beiträge*, p. 280) points to the existence of the Old Greek (OG) text before 116 B.C.E. This provides a *terminus a quo* for the putative reviser, dated by Tov (*Septuagint Translation*, pp. 165–67) to the early part of the period 116 B.C.E.–50 C.E., in view of later writings that presuppose the distinctive text of the reviser. There are three probable cases of such dependence in *kaige*-Theodotion; two in Heb. 8.8–12; and several in Josephus (*Antiquities* 10) and the *Vetus latina*. Tov prefers an early date since the revision of Jeremiah displays none of the literalism of *kaige*-Theodotion

or Aquila, and the absence of any trace of the OG text of Jeremiah β suggests that the OG was replaced relatively soon. Indirect support for an OG text before 116 B.C.E. comes from Hebrew manuscript fragments (4QJer^{b,d}) that underlie the Greek text and probably date from the first half of the second century B.C.E. (DJD, pp. 15, 172, 203).

Studies of its language have confirmed the Alexandrian origin of LXX Jeremiah together with the Pentateuch, Isaiah, Ezekiel, 1–4 Kings, etc. (Fernández Marcos, *Septuagint in Context*, p. 59). Whether its Hebrew *Vorlage* was produced locally or imported from Palestine is less certain.

III. Language

The Greek of LXX Jeremiah is Koine (note, e.g., the high frequency of $\text{o}\acute{\upsilon}$ $\mu\acute{\eta}$ instead of simple $\text{o}\acute{\upsilon}$; also *Grammar*, pp. 22–25). Interference from the source language may be seen throughout (*Grammar*, pp. 25–55), in features such as the use of $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ at the expense of other prepositions, or $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ and $\mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}$ rather than $\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha$ with the articular infinitive, or the absence of the attributive preposition between the article and the noun it modifies (Martin, ‘Syntactical’). Hebraisms are generated by fidelity to word order ($\pi\lambda\eta\gamma\gamma\eta\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\chi\theta\rho\omicron\upsilon\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\alpha\iota\sigma\acute{\alpha}\ \sigma\epsilon$, 37.14), idiom ($\delta\delta\varsigma\ \tau\eta\nu\ \phi\omega\nu\eta\gamma\nu$ for תני קול , ‘cry out’, 2.15; 22.20) and syntax ($\kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\tau\omicron$ for ויהי ; paratactic $\kappa\alpha\iota$ for $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$) (Stipp, *Das masoretische*, pp. 20–27). Together with occasional Egyptian words ($\pi\alpha\sigma\tau\omicron\phi\acute{\omicron}\rho\iota\omicron\nu$, 42.4; $\delta\iota\acute{\omega}\rho\upsilon\acute{\xi}$, 38.9), Semitic interference is more marked in Jeremiah β : for example, the idiom בעני (‘in [my] opinion’), rendered by the standard Koine $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\acute{\omega}\pi\iota\omicron\nu$ or $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\nu\tau\iota\omicron\nu$ in Jeremiah α , is rendered in Jeremiah β by the unidiomatic $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \acute{\omicron}\phi\theta\alpha\lambda\mu\omicron\iota\varsigma$.

Nevertheless when the translator needs to depart from the structure of the source language to follow Greek syntax, he generally does so—at least when the Hebrew is not difficult (§ IV). Thus we see clause-initial infinitives absolute rendered by an aorist ($\kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\delta\acute{\iota}\delta\alpha\acute{\xi}\alpha$ for וְלָמַד in 39.33; cf. 8.15; 14.19), or functionally equivalent renderings like $\text{o}\acute{\upsilon}\ \mu\acute{\eta}\dots\text{o}\acute{\upsilon}\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ for כל דבר... לא (in 39.17), where the principle of isomorphism has been abandoned for intelligibility. Just ten verses later (39.27) כל דבר is rendered by $\tau\iota$, presumably because the phrase belongs to a question rather than a negative statement. This willingness to depart from quantitative equivalence shows a concern with the target language as well as its source.

Variation in prepositions reflects a concern for Greek style. For example, לַע is variously rendered by *διά, εἰς, ἐπί, περί, πρός, ὑπέρ* and the dative. It is not unusual to see a prepositional phrase such as בַּכֶּסֶף (‘with money’) rendered by *ἀργυρίου* and *ἐν ἀργυρίῳ* within the same chapter (39.25, 44 respectively). At the same time lexical homogenisation of prepositions occurs, with *ἐπί*, for example, representing אַל, לַע, ל, ב and מן. Considerations of the target language are at work here (Martin, ‘Syntactical’, p. 306). Conjunctions and the article are added and omitted with similar freedom.

In short, by comparison with the Pentateuch the language of Jeremiah adheres more closely to the form of its source text, being similar to Bar. 1.1–3.8 at its most wooden, and to Ezekiel and the Twelve Prophets at its most idiomatic. Even though it is a Koine that reflects a high degree of Semitic interference, if the structures of the source language cannot be represented in the target language they have been ignored, and the translator’s choice of prepositions and conjunctions is often driven by considerations of idiomatic Greek. However, most cases of free translation reflect exegesis rather than literary style.

IV. Translation and Composition

Characterising the Greek translation of Jeremiah is complicated by the loss of the Hebrew *Vorlage*. Not all scholars are willing to concede that the translator was creative with his text, preferring to attribute as many cases as possible to the *Vorlage*.

The translator is consistent in his representation of both the elements of the underlying Hebrew text and their order. Indeed, isomorphism has been suggested as ‘the most basic norm’ of the translator (NETS, p. 876). While not always supplying the same Greek equivalent for a given Hebrew element, he usually represents each element in some way, including affixed articles, prepositions and suffixes. There are enough cases of Greek that are unclear or otherwise problematic to show that the translator’s concern was fidelity to his source (Stipp, *Das masoretische*, pp.36–52). However, to be faithful it is sometimes necessary to be free, even inconsistent, in one’s treatment of the source text. Tendencies, rather than consistent rules, include a lack of stereotyping and an avoidance

of lexical levelling; an array of approaches to difficult Hebrew; and various kinds of exegesis aimed at preserving the original meaning.

a. Stereotyping

The translator renders Hebrew nouns and verbs with great care, but does not aim at consistency. In Jeremiah, as in most of the Septuagint, a group of related Hebrew terms tends to be rendered by Greek terms from the same semantic domain, as context dictates. Table 2 provides a selection from the translation equivalents for the related Hebrew terms ‘acquire–inherit–take possession of–redeem’.

Table 2. Stereotyping and semantic domains in the Septuagint

<i>Hebrew term</i>	<i>is rendered in the LXX (including Jeremiah) by:</i>	
קנה (acquire)	λυτρόω (ransom)	κτάομαι
נחל (inherit)	κτάομαι (acquire)	κληρονομέω
ירש (possess)	κληρονομέω (inherit)	ἀγχιστεύω
גאל (redeem)	ἀγχιστεύω (redeem)	λυτρόω

Difficult or technical Hebrew words are more likely to attract a broad range of equivalents: צור ‘to besiege’ is rendered by συγκλείω ‘to enclose’ (21.4, 9), πολιορκέω ‘to besiege’ (46.1) or χαρακώω ‘to raise a pallisade’ (39.1). Common words, even though their semantic range may be quite different in the two languages, are usually given a stereotyped equivalent, resulting in Hebraisms (e.g., נתן / δίδωμι ‘to give’ in 8.23; 9.11, 13; 23.40; 39.40), although occasionally a vivid and idiomatic equivalent is preferred (e.g., נתן by ἐμβάλλω ‘to throw in’ in 20.2 and ἀποδίδωμι ‘to give back, restore’ in 22.13).

The translator’s sensitivity to stock phrases in Hebrew is apparent in his departure from such stereotyping. נטויה ‘outstretched’ is rendered by ὑψηλός ‘high’ throughout the LXX wherever the Hebrew stock phrase ‘by a strong hand and an outstretched arm’ appears (Deut. 4.34, etc.). The one exception is Jer. 21.5, where the adjectives are reversed (‘by an outstretched hand and a strong arm’), and the translator has chosen ἐκτείνω. This appears to be a conscious principle, namely the *avoidance of lexical or syntactic levelling*. See too the rendition of ירשה ‘possession’ (39.8) by κτήσασθαι instead of the expected παραλαμβάνω, used immediately before for גאולה ‘redemption’ (39.7); and שרף ‘burn’ by ἐμπυρίζω instead of the usual κατακαίω when καίω has just been used for

יצת 'kindle' (50.12; κατακαίω is used again for השר in the following verse). As there is no good reason to suppose that the translator's exemplar differed from the text preserved in MT these choices suggest an interest in preserving the variety of the source language at the sentence level. By contrast, a dramatic case of levelling is found in 14.7, where all members of the Hebrew triad עון, משובה, חטא ('iniquity', 'backsliding', 'sin') are rendered by a form of ἀμαρτία or ἀμαρτάνω.

We have already noted the pattern where a stereotype of Jeremiah β replaces a previous stereotype in Jeremiah α: e.g., אמת 'truth' is rendered in Jeremiah LXX by ἀλήθεια or ἀληθινός in Jer. 2.21; 4.2; 9.5; 14.13; 23.28 and 33.15, but by πίστις in 35.9; 39.41; 40.6 and 49.5 (further examples in Thackeray and Tov).

b. Difficult Hebrew

In cases where the translator might have found the Hebrew difficult, he adopts various strategies. (a) In some cases he simply passes on the difficulties. In 18.14, for example, the gloss of μαστοί 'breasts' for שדי 'field' makes the verse no easier to understand; and in 52.19 the obscure זהב זהב אשר is 'literally' rendered ἃ ἦν χρυσᾶ χρυσᾶ 'which were gold gold'. (b) Transcription is frequent in Jeremiah compared to other LXX books (Ziegler, *Beiträge*; NETS, p. 880; Stipp, *Das masoretische*, pp. 34–35). A word may be transcribed if it is obscure (e.g., חסידה 'heron, stork' at 8.7 is rendered ασιδα; other LXX translators also transcribe or guess), or considered a proper name (e.g., ναχαλ in 38.40), or potentially misleading (αδων in 41.5). (c) Double translation is found in 4.29, for example, where the translator, unsure of the meaning, renders בעבים by both 'cave' and 'thicket' (εἰς τὰ σπήλαια καὶ εἰς τὰ ἄλση) (Talmon, 'Conflate', p. 171). Though rare by comparison to, say, LXX Isaiah, other examples may be found (e.g., 4.1; 5.17; 18.20–22; 23.17). The technique is often used with lexical difficulties, but sometimes with theological (1.17) or literary (19.15) problems, and material from the immediate context is brought into service.

The types of freedom already discussed have an exegetical component, but the following examples are more frankly exegetical. The first two types, discourse literalism and contextual or historical accuracy, are dealt with here; the third, compensatory rendition, is addressed in § V. The fourth, theologically motivated translation, is considered in § VI.

c. Discourse Literalism

Exegetically motivated free renditions are not always easy to determine, since apparent patterns in the text may not have been created intentionally. The rendition of אֵל is a good example: its 199 representations in the Greek are evenly divided between οὐ and οὐ μή, the latter non-isomorphic equivalent increasingly preponderant as the book progresses. οὐ μή usually renders a syntactically prominent clause (e.g., 6.10; 10.5b; 11.19; 39.17).³ However, there are many exceptions, some clearly stylistic (e.g., οὐ μή for variation in a list at 16.6-8; 20.9), and some inexplicable (21.7). A picture emerges of a translator (or translators) who uses free rendition to emphasise points he considers important, without concern for consistency.

The way οὐ μή tracks syntactically prominent Hebrew clauses is indicative of a tendency to follow the textlinguistic contours of the original, frequent enough to be assigned to the translation technique. ‘Discourse literalism’ denotes inconsistency at the level of words that is consistent at the discourse level (usually the sentence level). Jeremiah 39.42 provides a good example (‘rel.’ indicates a relative particle preceding the verb):

כִּאֲשֶׁר הִבְאִתִּי	rel.- <i>qatal</i>	=	aor. ind. καθὰ ἐπήγαγον
כֵּן אֲנֹכִי מֵבִיא	subj.- <i>ptc.</i>	=	fut. ind. οὕτως ἐγὼ ἐπάξω
אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי דֹבֵר	subj.- <i>ptc.</i>	=	aor. ind. ἃ ἐλάλησα

In Hebrew the second clause (‘so I will bring’) is the most prominent of the three. The translation’s inconsistency leads to a loss of some of the aspectual colour of the two Hebrew participles, but creates a discourse with the same rhetorical shape.

In similar vein is the pair of Hebrew participles underlying 39.2 (< > marks a clear plus in MT):

וְאִזְ חִיל...צָרִים	ptc.	=	aor. ind. καὶ δύναμις ... ἐχαράκωσεν
וִירְמִיָּהוּ > הַנְּבִיא < הִיָּה כְּלוֹא	ptc.	=	impf. ind. καὶ Ἰερεμίας < > ἐφυλάσσετο

3. Typically, אֵל-*yiqtol*; rarely, *we*אֵל-*yiqtol*; never אֵל-*qatal*. See Shead, *Open Book*, pp. 80–82.

Although the presence of **אז** and **היה** in the LXX *Vorlage* is contested, the structure of the expressions is unchanged. The LXX has achieved the same prominence for the second clause by its choice of an imperfective aspect (Shead, *Open Book*, pp. 87–92).

A different example of discourse literalism is the surprisingly consistent way the rendering of the adjectives **רע** (‘evil’) and **טוב** (‘good’) is determined by grammatical considerations. When these adjectives modify a singular noun or stand alone as the object of a verb they receive a singular gloss; but when they are further modified by words like **כל** ‘all’, **זאת** ‘this’, or a preposition, Greek plurals are used. The following examples will serve to illustrate:

18.11	מדרכו הרעה (‘from his evil way’)	<i>ἀπὸ ὁδοῦ αὐτοῦ τῆς πονηρᾶς</i> (sg.)
49.6	אם-טוב ואם-רע (‘whether good or bad’)	<i>καὶ ἐὰν ἀγαθὸν καὶ ἐὰν κακόν</i> (sg.)
43.3	כל-הרעה (‘all the evil’)	<i>πάντα τὰ κακά</i> (pl.)
14.11	לטובה (‘for good’)	<i>εἰς ἀγαθὰ</i> (pl.)

Exceptions to this practice are rare.

d. Contextual or Historical Accuracy

The translator is less interested in making his translation equivalents consistent or harmonising parallel passages than he is in finding or creating forms that are true to the immediate context and the perceived historical meaning of the verse. Sometimes he adjusts his tenses: the future form *παραδοθήσεται* is used for **נתנה** (‘it has been given’) in 39.36, even though the same Hebrew form was rendered by an aorist in vv. 24, 25, because in the time-frame of v. 36 the city had not yet been handed over. At other times he chooses an unusual equivalent: in 39.20 the rare equivalent *γηγενής* (‘earth-born’) for **אדם** (‘human’), found only here and in Ps. 48.3, seems to have been chosen to achieve a gradation from Egypt to Israel to all humanity, whereas in the previous verse the standard equivalence **בני אדם** / *τῶν υἱῶν τῶν ἀνθρώπων* occurs. Elsewhere he adds words: in 39.12 the translation of **דדי** (my ‘uncle’) by *υἱοῦ ἀδελφοῦ πατρός μου* does not imply a *Vorlage* of **בן דדי***, but simply makes clear that **דדי** here means cousin, as it clearly did in 39.7-9. Another technique, primarily in Jeremiah α, is to alter pronominal suffixes. In 10.24 1st sg. suffixes are altered to 1st pl., ‘in order to distinguish more clearly

between Jeremiah and those for whom he prays' (McKane, *Commentary*, p. xxiii). Finally, Pietersma and Saunders suggest that the term *ψευδοπροφήτης* is introduced at the point (33.7) when the turn of events has revealed what these prophets really are (NETS, p. 877). See further McKane, *Commentary*, pp. xxi–xvii; Becking, 'Jeremiah's Book'; NETS, pp. 877–80.

V. Key Text-Critical Issues

The unrevised Old Greek text of Jeremiah is reasonably well preserved in Codex Vaticanus and related manuscripts; and when combined with Codex Alexandrinus on the one hand, and Codex Venetus on the other, solid ground exists on which to construct a critical text. Naturally the best manuscripts err, so that internal (exegetical) considerations come into play, and Ziegler's edition must remain provisional. The critic must judge how likely it is that the translator took care to be 'exact' at any given point. Since he sporadically added or omitted small elements such as *καί* and *ἐν*, the Göttingen edition is inevitably too consistent at points, although the effect is minor. The crucial text-critical issues arise at an earlier stage in the history of the text.

a. Major Discrepancies

The discrepancies in length and internal order between the Greek and Hebrew versions of Jeremiah have troubled scholars since Jerome, who believed that Greek copyists abbreviated their exemplar. Today scholars believe that the carefulness and isomorphic character of the translation militates against any theory of wholesale abridgement. Strong support comes from Qumran, especially 4QJer^b, which contains portions of Hebrew Jer. 9.22–10.21 that are very close to the LXX text form, in both length and internal order. There is now a broad consensus (although not universal: Fischer *Jeremia*, 1, p. xxx) that Jeremiah LXX translates an older, shorter Hebrew text than that represented in the MT. Less settled is the question whether the longer Hebrew version arose from piecemeal scribal additions and accidental rearrangement (Janzen, McKane), or from conscious editing by a recensor (Tov, Goldman, Stulman); it is the present writer's opinion that the latter fits the evidence better, and that

the creator of the edition behind MT aimed at improving the clarity and structure of the discourse, and at shaping the message to be relevant for the Babylonian community (Stulman). Nonetheless, most of the distinctive features of the longer version, such as its prolix titles and formulas, do no more than extend patterns already extant in the LXX *Vorlage*. Though much of the difference between the two Hebrew versions results from secondary expansions in MT, the LXX *Vorlage* is also marked by some secondary additions to the common base text, as well as significant omissions through haplography (Min, 'Minuses', pp. 148–50; Stipp, *Das masoretische*, p. 60; Lundbom, *Jeremiah 1–20*, pp. 885–87; Shead, *Open Book*, p. 249; Lundbom, *Jeremiah 37–52*, pp. 549–63).

b. Creativity

These text-critical issues raise the question whether a given feature of the text is the translator's creation, or was already present in his exemplar. Some find significant freedom in the translation (Goldman, McKane, Shead), while others find that the translator was rarely creative with his source text (Janzen, Stipp, Migsch). One's conclusion will be the result of a combination of factors, including literary judgements about the form and meaning of the texts. Certainly the overall care and accuracy of the translator counts against the view that he was responsible for the large-scale and structural revisions that characterise the longer and shorter texts to different extents. Such secondary addition and revision of names, tightening of macro-structure, clarifying of ambiguities and assimilation to parallels as exist in the LXX should be put down to its *Vorlage* (Shead, *Open Book*, pp. 247–50). Yet some creativity is inevitable in every translation, and Jeremiah's translational features, such as those emerging from the lexical, grammatical and stylistic constraints of the target language, display similar exegetical tendencies to those that mark unconstrained departures from its source text. That these departures originated in the translation and not its *Vorlage* is additionally borne out by an inductive examination of variants, both quantitative and qualitative, judged case-by-case rather than according to an overarching theory. In short, although there is a body of variants whose origins remain obscure, for the large part a picture can be formed of a translator who made a palpable mark on an already revised base text.

c. Compensation for Damage in the Exemplar

This unique textual situation has generated a category of exegetical rendition which is less clear-cut, being subject to the detection of corruption (often haplography) in the exemplar. However, departures from normal translation style in texts that also show signs of transmission error are a valuable corroboration of the latter. For example, in 21.7b differences of number may at first glance suggest a variant LXX *Vorlage*:

והכם לפי חרב	καὶ κατακόψουσιν αὐτοὺς ἐν στόματι μαχαίρας
לא יחוס עליהם	οὐ φείσομαι ἐπ' αὐτοῖς
ולא יחמל ולא ירחם	καὶ οὐ μὴ < > οἰκτιρήσω αὐτούς

Where the MT reads ‘He shall strike them with the edge of the sword; he shall not spare them or pity them or have compassion’, the translator has provided ‘They shall cut them into pieces with the edge of a sword; I will not be sparing toward them, and I will not have compassion on them’. As this is not the sort of secondary revision usually encountered in the underlying Hebrew editions of the book, the simplest explanation lies in the first part of the verse, where LXX lacks the name ‘Nebuchadrezzar’ and so has no antecedent for the 3rd sg. verbs of v. 7b. While it is possible that the MT added Nebuchadrezzar secondarily and revised the rest of the verse, the missing phrase in v. 7a is a prime candidate for haplography in the LXX *Vorlage*: **בִּיד נְבוּכַדְרֶאֱצַר מֶלֶךְ בָּבֶל וּבִיד**. In short, the translator appears to have found new subjects for the verbs from earlier in the verse (‘their enemies’ and ‘the Lord’ respectively) (McKane, *Commentary*, p. xviii).

A second example is 39.19a, where material from the previous verse is repeated in the LXX, but rearranged to produce phraseology that is unique and difficult: ὁ θεὸς ὁ μέγας ὁ παντοκράτωρ καὶ ὁ μεγαλῶνυμος κύριος. Of the possible explanations for this, few carry conviction. A late liturgical expansion would scarcely use the title ὁ παντοκράτωρ; a doublet in the LXX *Vorlage* should generate a phrase similar to LXX v. 18b and not a free rendition; and a supposed literal rendition founders on the impossibility of retroverting the phrase convincingly. In short, ‘the strange syntax suggests neither a free rendering of a hard text nor a strict rendering of a good text, but a damaged *Vorlage*’ (Shead, *Open Book*, p. 160).⁴

4. A tentative retroversion might run **הָאֵל הַגְּדוֹל (ה) צְבָאוֹת שְׁמוֹ גְּדוֹל יְהוָה***; the textual history of such a reading is beyond us to reconstruct, but may have involved

Finally, we may tentatively propose that where the translator has been forced to abandon lexical precision he ensures that the form of words he provides is quantitatively equivalent, achieving literalness in the number of words if nothing else.

VI. Ideology and Exegesis

This is a rare feature, and Zlotowitz (*Septuagint Translation*) has shown how the translator is unperturbed by anthropomorphism or other metaphorical language applied to God; however, the same licence is not extended when there is a perceived threat to what we might call the doctrine of God. Thus אִפְּלוֹ is rendered ἀποκρυβῆ in 39.17 and κρυβήσεται in the parallel v. 27, unique readings for a word normally rendered ‘impossible’ (e.g., Gen. 8.14, ἀδυνατέω) or ‘wonderful’ (e.g., Jer. 21.2, θαυμάσιος). Most probably the translator wanted to avoid the suggestion—even the negative suggestion—that something could be impossible for God (Shead, *Open Book*, pp. 126–28). Similarly, in the Hebrew text of 39.40 God promises that he will not turn back from following the people—the only verse where it is not the people following God. The LXX here has rendered the relative אשר אֲנִי by ἧν, thus making the covenant, not God, the object of the (transitive) turning back. In the next verse the LXX renders God’s promise to plant them ‘with all my heart and with all my soul’ (בְּכָל לְבִי וּבְכָל נַפְשִׁי) as καὶ ἐν πάσῃ καρδίᾳ καὶ ἐν πάσῃ ψυχῇ, leaving the first-person suffixes untranslated. Echoes of these renderings in the other ancient versions (Targum, Syriac, Vulgate) suggest that the translators were working within, or contributing to, a common exegetical tradition. A final example is the repeating of the final clause of 1.8 after 1.17 in a theologically motivated double translation that softens the impact of the verse.

In conclusion it should be stressed that the distinction between historical and theological renditions is artificial: a historically inaccurate text is a theological issue. Thus the translator converts the past tenses of 15.6-7 to future to avoid the theological difficulty of a divine judgement announced as complete, which had not in fact yet occurred.

a variant of v. 18b (Hebrew) created by accidental transposition and preserved in the margin of a MS, forming in turn the basis of a double translation in the LXX.

The impression one gains from studying Jeremiah LXX is of a translator for whom faithfulness to the source text means working one sentence at a time; staying as close to the original as possible while respecting the limits of the target language; conveying its lexical and text-linguistic light and shade by a judicious selection of translation equivalents; facilitating a proper understanding of the original meaning when necessary; smoothing over garbled passages where possible; and when the original is beyond recovery, simply conserving it without venturing to guess at its meaning (unless by way of double translation). Though he sets a high store by quantitative equivalence, the translator does not practice his principles with total consistency, but only as each occasion of translation suggests a strategy to his mind.

VII. Reception History

The book of Jeremiah as preserved in the MT is a text already reshaped to serve a Babylonian readership, and the LXX bears witness to an older form of this text while also being a commentary on it through its translation choices. While citations before the New Testament period are sparse, references to the life and times of the prophet are not. In the Hebrew canon (2 Chron. 35.25; 36.12; Dan. 9.2) we find reflections on his prediction of a 70-year exile; in subsequent Greek writings he is prominent as a sufferer (Lam. 1.1 superscription; Sir. 49.6-7), intercessor (2 Macc. 15.12-16) and preserver of cultic worship (2 Macc. 2.1-8; Ep. Jer.). Later Jewish writing continued this interest, with works such as the *Paraleipomena of Jeremiah* and *Vita of Jeremiah* (second to third centuries C.E.) adding legend to tradition. In rabbinic literature Jeremiah, while still associated with Moses as intercessor, had assumed the mantle of the prophet of doom and destruction, resulting in his book being placed at the start of the Latter Prophets.

Two sources that draw wholly or in part on LXX Jeremiah are Philo and the New Testament. Philo devoted more attention to Jeremiah than to any other prophet, reading Jeremiah as an allegory in which spiritual principles were signified by the literal meaning of the text (Siedlecki, 'Jeremiah', p. 565). The New Testament has few direct citations from Jeremiah: the index to the UBS Greek New Testament lists only Mt. 2.18 (Jer. 38.15); 1 Cor. 1.31 (Jer. 9.24); 2 Cor. 10.17 (Jer. 9.24); Heb. 8.8-12

(Jer. 38.31-34); Heb. 10.16-17 (Jer. 38.33-34). However, influences from the book of Jeremiah are strong in some of Paul's letters, in Hebrews, and in Revelation 18, a vision of Babylon's fall drawn extensively from Jeremiah 27–28. One of the most 'Jeremianic' of Paul's letters is 2 Corinthians, in which there are many echoes of the prophet's experience in Paul's descriptions of his ministry; but it is the new covenant that has had the most profound influence on New Testament writers.

In 2 Corinthians 3, for example, Paul uses Jer. 38.31-34 LXX as a hermeneutical lens for his exegesis of Exodus 34. The stress on inclusiveness in Jer. 38.33-34 becomes, in Paul's treatment, the vehicle for carrying the Sinai covenant into the age of the gentiles (Shead, 'New Covenant'). The new covenant citations in Hebrews are the longest OT citations in the New Testament, and pivotal in the argument of the book. And in the synoptic gospels Jesus' institution of the new covenant at the last supper draws on Jeremiah, most plainly in Luke's reference to the 'new' covenant (Lk. 22.20, echoing Jer. 38.31) and Matthew's reference to the forgiveness of many (Mt. 26.28, echoing Jer. 38.34, and balancing the citation of Jer. 38.15 in Mt. 1.18).

The apostolic fathers display little interest in Jeremiah, with only a handful of citations (e.g., *Barn.* 2.5-8). Of the early church fathers, Origen, Theodoret of Cyrrhus and the Cappadocian Basil wrote extensively on the Greek text of Jeremiah.

Bibliography

- Becking, B., 'Jeremiah's Book of Consolation: A Textual Comparison. Notes on the Masoretic Text and the Old Greek Version of Jeremiah xxx-xxxii', *VT* 44 (1994), pp. 145–69.
- Bogaert, P.-M., *Le livre de Jérémie, le prophète et son milieu, les oracles et leur transmission* (BETL 54; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1981).
- Curtis, A.H.W., and T. Römer (eds.), *The Book of Jeremiah and Its Reception* (BETL 128; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1997).
- Fernández Marcos, N., *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible* (trans. W.G.E. Watson; Leiden: Brill, 2000).
- Fischer, G., *Jeremia* (2 vols.; Freiburg: Herder, 2005).
- Goldman, Y., *Prophétie et royauté au retour de l'exil. Les origines littéraires de la forme massorétique du livre de Jérémie* (OBO 118; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1992).
- Janzen, J.G., *Studies in the Text of Jeremiah* (HSM 6; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973).

- Lundbom, J.R., *Jeremiah 1–20: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 21A; New York: Doubleday, 1999).
- Jeremiah 37–52: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 21C; New York: Doubleday, 2004).
- Martin, R.A., ‘Some Syntactical Criteria of Translation Greek’, *VT* 10 (1960), pp. 295–310.
- McKane, W., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Jeremiah* (ICC; 2 vols.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1986, 1996).
- Michael, T.S.L., ‘Bisectioning of Greek Jeremiah: A Problem to Be Revisited?’, *BIOSCS* 39 (2006), pp. 93–104.
- Migsch, H., *Jeremias Ackerkauf: Eine Untersuchung von Jeremia 32* (Österreichische biblische Studien 15; Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1996).
- Min, Y.-J., ‘The Minuses and Pluses of the LXX Translation of Jeremiah as Compared with the Massoretic Text: Their Classification and Possible Origins’ (Ph.D. dissertation, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1977).
- Movers, F.C., *De utriusque recensionis vaticanorum Ieremiae, graecae alexandrinae et hebraicae masorethicae, indole et origine commentatio critica* (Hamburgi: Fridericum Perthes, 1837).
- Nestle, E., *Das Buch Jeremia: Griechisch und Hebräisch* (Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1924).
- Pietersma, A., ‘An Excursus on Bisectioning Ieremias’ (electronic section of *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*. Online: <http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/nets/edition/ieremias-excursus.pdf>, accessed March 1, 2008).
- Scholz, A., *Der masorethische Text und die LXX-Uebersetzung des Buches Jeremias* (Regensburg: G.J. Manz, 1875).
- Shead, A.G., ‘The New Covenant and Pauline Hermeneutics’, in P.G. Bolt and M.D. Thompson (eds.), *The Gospel to the Nations: Perspectives on Paul’s Mission* (Leicester: Apollos, 2000), pp. 33–49.
- The Open Book and the Sealed Book: Jeremiah 32 in Its Hebrew and Greek Recensions* (JSOTSup 347; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002).
- Siedlecki, A., ‘Jeremiah, Book of (Interpretation through the 19th Century)’, in J.H. Hayes (ed.), *Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation*, vol. II (Nashville: Abingdon, 1999), pp. 564–70.
- Soderlund, S., *The Greek Text of Jeremiah: A Revised Hypothesis* (JSOTSup 47; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985).
- Spohn, M.G.L., *Ieremias Vates e versione Iudaeorum Alexandrinorum ac reliquorum interpretum graecorum emendatus notisque criticis illustratus* (Lipsiae: Sumptibus Io. Ambros. Barthii, 1824).
- Stipp, H.-J., *Das masoretische und alexandrinische Sondergut des Jeremiabuches: Textgeschichtlicher Rang, Eigenarten, Triebkräfte* (OBO 136; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1994).
- ‘Offene Fragen zur Übersetzungskritik des antiken griechischen Jeremiabuches’, *JNSL* 17 (1991), pp. 117–28.

The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint

- Streane, A.W., *The Double Text of Jeremiah (Massoretic and Alexandrian) Compared, Together with an Appendix on the Old Latin Evidence* (Cambridge: Deighton Bell, 1896).
- Stulman, L., *The Other Text of Jeremiah: A Reconstruction of the Hebrew Text Underlying the Greek Version of the Prose Sections of Jeremiah with English Translation* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1985).
- Talmon, S., 'Conflate Readings (OT)', in K. Crim *et al.* (eds.), *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible Supplementary Volume* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1976), pp. 170–73.
- Thackeray, H.St.J., 'Notes and Studies: The Greek Translators of Jeremiah', *JTS* 4 (1903), pp. 245–65.
- Tov, E., 'Exegetical Notes on the Hebrew Vorlage of the LXX of Jeremiah 27 (34)', *ZAW* 91 (1979), pp. 73–93.
- The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch: A Discussion of an Early Revision of the LXX of Jeremiah 29–52 and Baruch 1:1–3:8* (HSM 8; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976).
- Ulrich, E., *et al.* (eds.), *Qumran Cave 4* (DJD 15; Oxford: Clarendon, 1997).
- Ziegler, J. (ed.), *Beiträge zur Ieremias-Septuaginta* (Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1958).
- Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum*. Vol. XV, *Ieremias, Baruch, Threni, Epistula Ieremiae* (2nd ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976 [1957]).
- Zlotowitz, B.M., *The Septuagint Translation of the Hebrew Terms in Relation to God in the Book of Jeremiah* (New York: KTAV, 1981).

Baruch

Daniel Ryan

Editions

(a) Standard Greek Editions

- Göttingen, vol. XV, *Ieremias, Baruch, Threni, Epistula Ieremiae* (Ziegler, 1976; 2nd ed.).
Rahlfs-Hanhart, vol. II, pp. 748–55.
Swete, vol. III, pp. 351–59.

(b) Modern Translations

- NETS (Michael, 2007), pp. 925–27.
LXX.D (Kraus, 2009), pp. 1343–48.
Bd'A 25.2 (Assan-Dhôte and Moatti-Fine, 2008).

I. General Characteristics

Baruch comprises four main parts: a narrative introduction (1.1-15a), a confessional prayer (1.15b-3.8), a wisdom poem (3.9-4.4), and a prophetic exhortation (4.5-5.9). The introduction (1.1-15a) sets the text in exilic-period Babylon and attributes authorship to Jeremiah's scribe, Baruch (Jer. 36.27, 32). At the time of Jerusalem's capture (Bar. 1.2), Baruch is writing to the Jerusalem community, on behalf of the exiles, with instructions to recite aloud (ἐξάγορεύσαι) his composition in the temple (1.14) and make offerings (1.10).¹

1. Some debate exists as to the identity of the book read aloud by Baruch (1.1, 3) and sent to Jerusalem (1.14). If Baruch initially existed as an addition to Jeremiah, it is possible that the whole of Jeremiah is implied. Alternatively, 'the book' might

General consensus regards Baruch as a pseudepigraphon from the second century B.C.E. to mid-first century B.C.E. Perceived thematic incoherence and inconsistent linguistic styles have resulted in the common assertion of composite structure (e.g., Burke, *Poetry*, p. 6; Martin, 'Syntax', p. 361; Wright, *Baruch*, p. 46; Loader, *Pseudepigrapha*, pp. 81–82). A Hebrew *Vorlage* is widely agreed for 1.1–3.8 (Moore, 'Toward', p. 316; Goldstein, 'Apocryphal', p. 187; Nickelsburg, 'Bible Rewritten', p. 146) and often suggested for 3.9–5.9 (Pfeiffer, *History*, p. 422; Burke, *Poetry*; Loader, *Pseudepigrapha*, p. 82). Cited in support are Hebraisms, translation mistakes, and linguistic links with the Septuagint.

Some recent scholarship has critiqued this consensus over Baruch's Hebrew *Vorlage* and composite structure. Difficulty with evaluating Hebraisms and Septuagintal parallels has led a minority to advocate Baruch as a Greek composition (Watson, *Paul*, pp. 457–58 nn. 72–75; Davila, '(How)', pp. 51–60). At the same time, Baruch's literary unity and purposive, thematic coherence has been increasingly emphasised (Nickelsburg, 'Bible Rewritten'; Steck, *Apokryphe*; Mukenge, *L'unité*). In particular, the Deuteronomistic schema (Deut. 30.1-10) may be regarded as Baruch's governing ideology: Israel rebels (Bar. 1.20-22), returns to Torah (4.1-4) and is restored (5.9). In this light, Baruch could be read as a unified Greek production, similar to late Hellenistic Jewish works with regard to exilic setting (*4 Ezra*, Daniel, Tobit), Deuteronomistic ideology (2 Maccabees, *Testament of Naphtali*, *Testament of Levi*), and in the style of 'rewritten Bible' (Sirach, Judith).

II. Time and Place of Composition

Baruch's possibly independent sections and multiple authors make dating difficult. However, a *terminus ante quem* of ca. 165 B.C.E. is frequently asserted on the basis of close parallels with Daniel 9, *Psalms of Solomon* 11, Sirach 24, and LXX Jeremiah (Dancy, *Shorter*, p. 171;

refer to the rest of Baruch (1.15a–5.9) (Steck, *Apokryphe*) or just the confessional section (1.15a–3.8) (Corley, 'Emotional'). Much depends on the literary unity of Baruch and the possibility of multiple authors.

Burke, *Poetry*, pp. 28–29; Marttila, ‘Deuteronomistic’, p. 322). The significance of these parallels depends on whether Baruch is primary or secondary. Baruch 1.15–2.19 retains the sequential order of Daniel 9, with expansions suggesting Baruch as derivative.² On the other hand, it is possible that an independent source prayer is behind both versions (Moore, ‘Toward’, pp. 316–17; Nickelsburg, ‘Bible Rewritten’, p. 143; Loader, *Pseudepigrapha*, p. 81). More significant are the close linguistic parallels between Dan. Th. 9.7-8, 15 and Bar. 1.15-16 and 2.11. For Watson, agreement here establishes a *terminus ante quem* of the first-century B.C.E. (Watson, *Paul*, pp. 457–58 nn. 74–75).

Linguistic links with LXX Jeremiah 29–52 have led some to identify the translator or redactor of Bar. 1.1–3.8 with that of LXX Jeremiah 29–52 (Tov, *Septuagint Translation*; Salvesen, ‘Baruch’, p. 113; Loader, *Pseudepigrapha*, p. 236; but cf. Goldstein, ‘Apocryphal’, p. 188 n. 34).³ If so, use of the Greek prophets in Sirach puts a *terminus ante quem* of 116 B.C.E. for Bar. 1.1–3.8.

Linguistic and motif parallels are evident between Bar. 4.36–5.9 and *Psalms of Solomon* 11. The closest links, retaining sequential ordering, are between Bar. 5.5-8 and *Pss. Sol.* 11.2-5. Although Steck argues for the psalm’s dependence (*Apokryphe*, pp. 240–42), a majority views the Baruch material as derivative. They cite the gradual introduction of *Psalms of Solomon* 11 material in Bar. 4.36–5.9 and lack of connection with the section in Bar. 5.5-9 (Watson, *Paul*, pp. 468–69 n. 87; Wright ‘Psalms’, p. 648). Any diffusion, however, in the Bar. 4.36–5.9 poem

2. See Moore, ‘Toward’, pp. 312–17: e.g., Bar. 1.15-16 and Dan. 9.7-8; Bar. 1.21 and Dan. 9.10; Bar. 1.19 and Dan. 9.11; Bar. 2.1-2 and Dan. 9.12-13; Bar. 2.11-12 and Dan. 9.15; Bar. 2.14 and Dan. 9.17. Although Watson suggests Baruch reverses Dan. 9.7-8 (Bar. 1.15-16) and Dan. 9.5-6 (Bar. 1.17-18, 21), it is not sufficiently clear that Dan. 9.5-6 is the source of Bar. 1.17-18, 21 (ἐναντι κυρίου in Bar. 1.17 is absent from Dan. 9.5; while βασιλεῖς... δυνάστας... πατέρας... παντὶ ἔθνει in Dan. 9.6 are absent from Bar. 1.18): parallels here are loose and general.

3. Thackeray identifies the translator of Bar. 1.1–3.8 with the translator of LXX Jeremiah chs. 29–52 (Thackeray, ‘Greek Translators’, p. 265). Tov adapts Thackeray’s view, arguing that a translation of Bar. 1.1–3.8 was redacted by the editor of LXX Jeremiah chs. 29–52 (Tov, *Septuagint Translation*, p. 6). Davila has questioned this thesis, since it assumes that a wholesale redaction of LXX Jeremiah never existed (Davila, ‘(How)’, p. 54).

(especially Bar. 5.5-9) is not obvious, and it remains possible that *Psalms of Solomon* 11 is an abridgement or shares a source with Baruch (Pfeiffer, *History*, p. 422).⁴

A *terminus ad quem* of the First Jewish Revolt (70 C.E.) is likely. The temple cult is active (Bar. 1.8, 10, 14), and the poem of restoration (4.5–5.9) and prayer for foreign rulers (1.11) are difficult to correlate with post-70 C.E. concerns (Corley, ‘Emotional’, p. 231; Watson, *Paul*, p. 458).

Place of composition is uncertain (Tov, *Septuagint Translation*, p. 160; Salvesen, ‘Baruch’, p. 113). The exilic setting might imply a Diasporan origin, but concern with Jerusalem’s restoration (Bar. 4.30–5.9), temple cult (1.8, 10), ancestral land (2.34), and the people of Judah and Israel (1.15; 3.1, 9) make a Palestinian provenance likely (Martilla, ‘Deuteronomistic’, p. 323).

III. Language

The thematic and stylistic inconsistencies of the book (see above § I) are also reflected in the language. Throughout, the book is written in standard Koine but displays a degree of interference from the source language. Thackeray (*Grammar*, p. 13) classed the first half of the book, 1.1–3.8, as a literal rendering akin to those books that are similar to the style of Theodotion. The second half, 3.9 onwards, he described as literary and Atticistic, and this is borne out by the evidence.

a. 1.1-15a

Some features of the prose introduction reflect Semitic idiom and syntax. There is parataxis with *καί* and verb-subject-object word order (e.g., 1.3, ἀνέγνω Βαρουχ τοὺς λόγους ‘Baruch read out the words’). Additionally, the use of ἐν τῷ with infinitive (1.8), reintroduction of Baruch as a substantive through oblique αὐτός, and the articular infinitive with preposition (μετὰ τὸ ἀποικίσαι, 1.9) may be Hebraisms. Linguistic parallels with LXX Jeremiah exist, especially LXX Jeremiah 29–52.

4. Moore cites the tense shift in Bar. 5.5-9, absent from *Psalms of Solomon* 11, as evidence for the psalm’s originality. Goldstein points to the same shift to make the opposite point. Neither can be asserted with certainty.

Baruch 1.9 reproduces Jer. 24.1, adding τοὺς δυνατοὺς ‘the leaders’ and τὸν λαὸν τῆς γῆς ‘the people of the land’, which are closer in style to LXX Jeremiah 29–52 (e.g., 40.9; 44.2).

b. 1.15b–3.8

There are considerable Hebraic stylistic and syntactical features, including parataxis with καί, use of ἄνθρωπος (2.2) over ἕκαστος for distributive determiner (Hebrew שׂא), ὅτι for י, λέγων for רמא, υἱοὶ Ἰσραήλ ‘sons of Israel’ as a general identifier, and postpositive pronouns. In this section and the introduction, κύριος is used for the divine name (although κύριος παντοκράτωρ ‘Lord almighty’ in Bar. 3.1, 4). In addition to Daniel 9 and Deuteronomy 28–32, many linguistic links exist with LXX Jeremiah 29–52. For example, the apostasy of Bar. 1.22 is said to be the result of Judah following its own διανοία ‘intention’ as in Jer. 38.33 (cf. δουλεύειν, Jer. 25.6), Moses is described as παῖς ‘servant’ in Bar. 1.20 as in Jer. 44.18; 51.22 (cf. δοῦλος, Jer. 11.5), and the tripartite punishment in Bar. 2.25 contains ἐν ἀποστολῇ ‘in torment’ as in Jer. 34.36 (cf. ἐν θανάτῳ, Jer. 14.12).

c. 3.9–4.5

Although not qualifying as Greek prosody, the remainder of Baruch is frequently defined as poetry on grounds of parallelism, stanza division with an imperative-vocative formation, repetition of phraseology, and relatively consistent unit length (Goldstein, ‘Apocryphal’, p. 188; Burke, *Poetry*, p. 5; Loader, *Pseudepigrapha*, p. 82). There is a stylistic shift from Bar. 1.1–3.8, with postpositive particle δέ replacing καί, and θεός replacing κύριος. On the many neologisms, see § IV. As the thematic focus turns to wisdom and Torah obedience, scriptural parallels move to Sirach 24, Job 28.12–28 and Proverbs 1–9.

d. 4.6–5.9

A stylistic shift from Bar. 1.1–3.8 is evident as postpositive particles δέ and γάρ replace καί and ὅτι. Hebraic idiom is apparent in the postposition of enclitic pronouns. The divine epithet αἰώνος ‘eternal’ (cf. θεός in 3.9–4.4 and κύριος in 1.1–3.8) is unique to this section. Although two linguistic links with LXX Jeremiah are present (Bar. 4.23 and 4.34), Isaiah 40–66, LXX Psalm 87, and *Psalms of Solomon* 11 are dominant.

IV. Translation and Composition

Since Kneucker's and Tov's Hebrew reconstructions of Bar. 1.1–3.8, consensus has posited a Hebrew *Vorlage* for 1.1–3.8 (Goldstein, 'Apocryphal'; Martin, 'Syntax'; Salvesen, 'Baruch', p. 112). Less certainty exists over the linguistic history of Bar. 3.9–5.9, although a Hebrew *Vorlage* has been advocated since Burke's retroversion (*Poetry*; see Goldstein, 'Apocryphal'; Werline, *Penitential*, p. 88; Marttila, 'Deuteronomistic', p. 321; but contrast Nickelsburg, 'Bible Rewritten', p. 146; Salvesen, 'Baruch', p. 112). Beside Hebraisms and Septuagintal links (see above § II.c), a Hebrew original is suggested by possible translation errors. These include the unknown 'river Sud' (1.4), which could be a misreading of letters: the 'river Sur' (ט instead of ס) is named in 4QpJer in relation to the exile. A misreading of a homonym is possible in 1.9, where מַסְגֵּר might have been rendered 'prisoners' instead of 'metal workers' (as in LXX Jer. 24.1; 36.2). Similarly, mistaken identification of the root may explain the confusing 'prayer of the dead' (τεθνηκότων) in 3.4, where מַת should have been 'people'. In 2.23, ἔξωθεν Ἱερουσαλήμ 'outside Jerusalem' may be an erroneous rendering of 'streets of Jerusalem' (תוצות; cf. δίδων in the parallel at Jer. 7.34).

Identification of a Hebrew *Vorlage* mostly derives from Hebraisms and 'translation Greek' noted by early scholarship (Kneucker, *Buch*; Tov, *Septuagint Translation*; Burke, *Poetry*). Advocacy of a Greek original is part of a wider, recent methodological concern with Semitisms. Although the scholarship in this area cannot be repeated fully, it has critiqued our ability to identify translation techniques and to distinguish Hebraisms from Semitic-style Greek (Aitken, 'Language'; Davila, '(How)'; Gathercole, *Composition*). In short, with regard to Baruch, Hebraic idioms and Septuagintal parallels do not necessarily establish a Hebrew original, but could be a Greek writer's style and use of Septuagint source texts.

The frequency and density of Baruch's biblical references complicates the issue. For Kneucker, Tov, and Burke, they enable Hebrew retroversion by delineating a source corpus. Yet, for more recent scholars, this has meant that Hebraisms and translation errors can be explained as mistakes in Septuagint sources and as the author's Semitic style. Davila and Watson have argued for a Greek composition: 'the apparent Semitic

interference is an illusion arising from the fact that the author borrowed heavily from the content and style of the Greek bible' (Davila, '(How)', p. 54; also Watson, *Paul*, pp. 456–48).

Positive evidence for a Greek original might be taken from neologisms (see Burke, *Poetry*, for a comprehensive list). These include, for example, μακροβίωσις 'longevity' in 3.14 (cf. μῆκος βίου, Prov. 3.2; μακροημέρευσις, Sir. 1.12, 20; πολλῶ βίω, Job 12.12), οἱ ἐκζητῆται τῆς συνέσεως 'the seekers of understanding', 3.23 (cf. ἐζήτουν σύνεσιν, Dan. Theod. 8.15; ἐξεζήτουν, LXX Ps. 77.34; ζητήσουσίν με, Prov. 1.28), and οἱ γίγαντες οἱ ὀνομαστοί...ἀπώλοντο 'the famous giants...died' in 3.26–28 (cf. γίγαντες...ὀνομαστοί, Gen. 6.4; ἀπολλυμένων...γιγάντων, Wis. 14.6). Further evidence may be apparent in verses with no obvious Hebrew equivalent. These include, for example, ὀργὴν παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ 'anger from God' in 4.9 (Burke, *Poetry*, p. 161 suggests the Hebrew would be genitival—of God—and not prepositional) and δεκαπλασιάζω 'multiply by ten' (4.28), which has no obvious Hebrew parallel. Moreover, although the maternal Jerusalem motif (Bar. 4.36–5.9) is found in Isa. 49.18 and 60.4, Baruch's amendment of ἄρον κύκλω 'lift up around (your eyes)' (Isa. 49.18; 60.4) to περίβλεψαι 'look about' (Bar. 4.36) may evince original Greek composition. Baruch here mixes Isaiah's motif with LXX Pentateuchal phraseology (i.e., ἀναβλέψας...ἀνατολάς in Deut. 3.27; Gen. 13.14).

V. Key Text-Critical Issues

There are no surviving Hebrew witnesses to the book of Baruch, and no fragments have been found at Qumran. The Greek text of Baruch is attested in four uncials (Alexandrinus, Vaticanus, Marchalianus, and Venetus; Baruch is absent from Sinaiticus and Ephraemi Rescriptus) and thirty-four minuscules (cf. Göttingen; Tov, *Septuagint Translation*, p. 11; Burke, *Poetry*, p. 9). There are two Syriac witnesses; one of which, a translation of the fifth column of Origen's *Hexapla*, has marginal notes at Bar. 1.17 and 2.3 identifying words 'not in the Hebrew' (Thackeray, 'Greek Translators', p. 261). Although possibly referring to a Hebrew *Vorlage*, they more likely identify words absent from Baruch's scriptural sources (Salvesen, 'Baruch', p. 112; Burke, *Poetry*, p. 12). Baruch is also attested in Old Latin (Vulgate, Cavensis, Vallicellianus, Legionensis),

Coptic, Ethiopic, Arabic, and Armenian. It is possible that the final text initially existed as an addition to LXX Jeremiah: most LXX MSS have Baruch following Jeremiah and preceding Lamentations, and patristic authors cite Baruch as Jeremaic (Bogaert, 'Personnage'). For example, Irenaeus (*Adv. Her.* 5.5) cites Bar. 4.36–5.9, while Clement of Alexandria (*Paed.* 1.10.91–92) cites Bar. 4.2 and 3.9. The Vulgate has the Epistle of Jeremiah as ch. 6 of Baruch.

There are few significant variants. With regard to dating, the variants for the unspecified month in 1.2 are noteworthy. Since Old Latin details the month as the fifth, it is possible that a haplographic error has occurred with the preceding τῷ ἔτει τῷ πέμπτῳ 'in the fifth year'.

Variants for Bar. 4.27 help clarify the object of ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐπάγοντος. The earliest Syriac witness ('Sy' in Ziegler's critical edition) would suggest ταῦτα, while Burke suggests a haplographic error (cf. 4.29) omitting 'τὰ κακά' (cf. dative pronoun in some LXX minuscules) (Burke, *Poetry*, p. 219). In either instance, the meaning is not affected.

Kneucker drops Bar. 3.38 as a Christian interpolation, but there is no text-critical evidence for this (Kneucker, *Buch*, p. 131). Indeed, the incarnate wisdom motif occurs in Wis. 9.10 and Sir. 24.10–12.

VI. Ideology and Exegesis

Exegetical interest in Baruch is generally concerned with the book's compositional integrity, scriptural allusions, and ideology of sin and obedience. Where early scholarship emphasises composite structure and thematic disunity, Baruch is often considered an anthology of differing perspectives. More recently, confidence in the book's purposive unity has grown, with particular emphasis on Baruch's unifying Deuteronomistic schema.

Much early scholarship, defining Baruch as a composite work, is concerned with the thematic disunity of Baruch's sections. Pfeiffer identifies a general theme of 'sin, punishment, and forgiveness' with an 'incongruous' wisdom poem; Burke notes 'a series of exilic vignettes' and 'several perspectives' assembled by a redactor; and Dancy detects inconsistency in Baruch's depiction of foreign rulers and the wisdom poem (Pfeiffer, *History*, p. 423; Burke, *Poetry*, p. 6; Dancy, *Shorter*, pp. 169–73). Early exegetical focus is on Baruch's use of biblical texts

and its derivative nature. Thus, Moore and Wambacq have explicated single passages in their literary context. Moore analyses Bar. 1.15–2.19 and 4.36–5.9 as possible adaptations of synagogue liturgies, while Wambacq comments on replication of Dan. 9.5–19 in the self-contained Bar. 1.15–2.9 prayer (Moore, ‘Toward’, pp. 312–20; Wambacq, ‘Prières’).

With increasing appreciation of Baruch’s intentional thematic and structural unity, some scholars have offered contextualised interpretations. Goldstein’s identification of anti-Hasmonean propagandistic fiction has been particularly influential (Goldstein, ‘Apocryphal’, p. 189; Nickelsburg, ‘Bible Rewritten’, p. 145; Werline, *Penitential*, pp. 87–88). Nebuchadnezzar is interpreted pseudonymously as Antiochus IV, Belshazzar as Antiochus V, and priest Joakim as Alcimus (1 Macc. 7.5). The *καχοῖς* (Bar. 2.9) are paralleled with the persecution of Antiochus IV (1 Macc. 1.20–64), and prayers for Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar (Bar. 1.11) as the ideological refrain of Alcimus’s pro-Seleucid faction (1 Macc. 7.12–15). By Goldstein’s exegesis, Baruch advocates submission to Antiochus V (Bar. 1.11–12; 4.25), and preaches that victory will not arrive through the Maccabaeen rebellion but via remission of sins through punishment (Bar. 4.5–5.9) and Torah obedience (Bar. 3.9–4.4). Nickelsburg, although admitting that a later date is possible, suggests a ca. 164/3 B.C.E. context. Like Goldstein, he identifies pro-Antiochus V ideology, but also notes concern with the return of Jewish slaves (2 Macc. 5.14, 24; 1 Macc. 1.32). In Werline’s study of Second Temple penitential prayer, Bar. 1.1–3.8 is interpreted within an anti-Hasmonean propagandistic schema. Steck, similarly, posits a 163–162 B.C.E. context, but identifies authorship with the Hasideans. Alternatively, Corley (‘Emotional’, pp. 228–32) has argued for Pompey’s conquest (63 C.E.) as the historical backdrop (King Jeconiah as Aristobulus II; the Babylon community as the Jews exiled to Rome).

Anti-Hasmonean interpretations encounter problems in their over-reliance on Bar. 1.1–15a. The introduction, quite apart from being subversive, is more likely a generalised, schematic scene, setting an exilic backdrop appropriate to the themes of sin and restoration (cf. Floyd, ‘Penitential’, p. 54). At any rate, Baruch’s historical allusions are infrequent, and historical data for the period of Judas Maccabeus is fragmentary. It is difficult to be certain as to the identity of Hasmonean

opponents, since they receive only brief treatment in our sources (e.g., the ‘godless’ in 1 Macc. 7.5; the ‘scribes’ in 1 Macc. 7.12; the complex relation with Alcimus in 1 Macc. 7.16).

Recent scholarship has increasingly emphasised Baruch’s purposive unity of theme and structure. Although still regarded by some as an editor’s collection of independent units (e.g., Burkes, ‘Wisdom’, p. 269; Salvesen, ‘Baruch’, pp. 112–13), others have followed Steck (*Apokryphe*) and Mukenge (*L’unité*) in determining ideological and literary integrity (e.g., Marttila, ‘Deuteronomistic’; Hogan, ‘Elusive’; Corley, ‘Emotional’). Principally, a Deuteronomistic ideology of sin and a concern with Israel’s transformation have been identified as Baruch’s unifying themes. In this way, recent thematic treatments of the penitentiary prayer in 1.15b–3.8 (e.g., Floyd, ‘Penitential’; Marttila, ‘Deuteronomistic’), the 3.9–4.4 wisdom poem (e.g., Hogan, ‘Elusive’), and the prophetic exhortation (e.g., Caldich-Benages, ‘Jerusalem’) have contextualised readings with Baruch’s unifying Deuteronomistic ideology and depiction of Israel’s transformation from exile to restoration. Some scholars have also examined the rhetorical pattern of the whole text. Corley proposes a unified emotional pattern for Baruch: Israel moves from weeping to joyous restoration (cf. 4.23), Israel’s enemies move from victory to defeat (4.32–33), and God progresses from anger (1.13) to mercy (3.2) and compassion (2.27) (Corley, ‘Emotional’, pp. 225–52). The movement from weeping to restoration is the literary expression of Baruch’s Deuteronomistic framework. Watson has commented on Baruch’s exposition of the sin–exile and obedience–return ideology in Deut. 30.1–10. The Deuteronomistic formula is operational throughout: in 1.1–3.8 the Daniel 9 prayer is rehabilitated in Deuteronomistic terms; in 3.9–4.4 wisdom is identified with Torah and proposed as the path to life; and in 4.5–5.9 the Deuteronomistic promise of restoration is restated. Indeed, Baruch’s exilic setting is itself a hermeneutic device, demonstrating the historical manifestation of sin–exile–return ideology. At the same time, Baruch’s biblical parallels assume tripartite Torah division: Deuteronomy and Leviticus in 1.15b–3.8, Proverbs in 3.9–4.4, and Isaiah in 4.5–5.9. In terms of literary context, Baruch’s exhortation of Torah obedience and reworking of Deut. 30.1–10 find numerous parallels (e.g., *T. Levi* 13.1–16.5; *T. Jud.* 13.1 and 26.1; *T. Dan* 5.1–13; 2 Macc. 6.12–17; *Jdt.* 5.5–21).

VI. Reception History

The figure of Baruch is associated with the Syriac *Apocalypse of Baruch* (2 *Baruch*), the Greek *Apocalypse of Baruch* (3 *Baruch*), and the *Paraleipomena Jeremiou* (4 *Baruch*). Baruch is not mentioned in the New Testament or Apostolic Fathers, even with regard to the incarnate wisdom motif in 3.38 (cf. Jn 1.14; Rom. 8.3; Heb. 2.14), although Baruch does appear in canon lists from the fourth century (Athanasius, *Ep. Fest.* 39; Cyril of Jerusalem, *Cat.* 4.35; Epiphanius, *Pan.* 8.6.1-4). Early Jewish and Christian writings assign Baruch uncertain prophetic status. The Masoretes saw Baruch as Jeremiah's scribe (e.g., Jer. 36.27, 32) and the Byzantine *Vitae Prophetarum* excludes Baruch. Yet the earliest quotation from Baruch (Athenagorus, *Leg.* 9) names Baruch as a prophet, and some authority is suggested where Optatus of Milevis appeals to Baruch in a church controversy (*Against the Donatists* 7.1). With regard to biblical theology, Baruch has received some attention as to the ethical system offered by its exegesis of sin, exile, and repentance (Harrington, *Invitation*, p. 93; see also Harlow, *Greek*, p. 168; Wright, *Baruch*, pp. 113–21).

Bibliography

- Aitken, J.K., 'The Language of the Septuagint: Recent Theories, Future Prospects', *Bulletin of Judaean-Greek Studies* 24 (1999), pp. 24–33.
- Assan-Dhôte, I., and J. Moatti-Fine (eds.), *La Bible d'Alexandrie*. Vol. XXV.2, *Baruch, Lamentations, Lettre de Jérémie* (Paris: Cerf, 2005).
- Bogaert, P.-M., 'Le personnage de Baruch et l'histoire du livre de Jérémie. Aux origines du Livre deutérocanonique de Baruch', in E.A. Livingstone (ed.), *Papers Presented to the Fifth International Congress on Biblical Studies, Oxford, 1973*, VII (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1982), pp. 73–82.
- Burke, D.G., *The Poetry of Baruch: A Reconstruction and Analysis of the Original Hebrew Text of Baruch 3:9–5:9* (SBLSCS 10; Chico: Scholars Press, 1982).
- Burkes, S., 'Wisdom and Law: Choosing Life in Ben Sira and Baruch', *JSJ* 30 (1999), pp. 253–76.
- Calduch-Benages, N., 'Jerusalem as Widow (Baruch 4:5-5:9)', in H. Lichtenberger and U. Mittman-Richtert (eds.), *Biblical Figures in Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009), pp. 147–64.
- Corley, J., 'Emotional Transformation in the Book of Baruch', in R. Egger-Wenzel and J. Corley (eds.), *Emotions from Ben Sira to Paul* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2012), pp. 225–52.

The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint

- Dancy, J.C., *The Shorter Books of the Apocrypha* (CBC; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972).
- Davila, J.R., '(How) Can We Tell If a Greek Apocryphon or Pseudepigraphon Has Been Translated from Hebrew or Aramaic?', *JSP* 15 (2005), pp. 3–61.
- Floyd, M.H., 'Penitential Prayer in the Second Temple Period from the Perspective of Baruch', in M.J. Boda, D.K. Falk and R.A. Werline (eds.), *Seeking the Favor of God: The Development of Penitential Prayer in Second Temple Judaism*, vol. II (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007), pp. 51–82.
- Gathercole, S.J., *The Composition of the Gospel of Thomas: Original Language and Influences* (SNTSMS 151; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012).
- Goldstein, J.A., 'The Apocryphal Book of I Baruch', *PAAJR* 46/47 (1979–80), pp. 179–99.
- Harlow, D.C., *The Greek Apocalypse of Baruch (3 Baruch) in Hellenistic Judaism and Early Christianity* (STVP 12; Leiden: Brill, 1996).
- Harrington, D.J., *Invitation to the Apocrypha* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999).
- Hogan, K.M., 'Elusive Wisdom and the Other Nations in Baruch', in D.C. Harlow (ed.), *The 'Other' in Second Temple Judaism* (Festschrift J.J. Collins; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011), pp. 145–59.
- Kneucker, J.J., *Das Buch Baruch* (Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1879).
- Loader, W.R.G., *The Pseudepigrapha on Sexuality: Attitudes towards Sexuality in Apocalypses, Testaments, Legends, Wisdom, and Related Literature* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011).
- Martin, R., 'Syntax Criticism of Baruch', in C.E. Cox (ed.), *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Leuven 1989* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991), pp. 361–71.
- Marttila, M., 'The Deuteronomistic Ideology and Phraseology in the Book of Baruch', in H. von Weissenberg, J. Pakkala and M. Marttila (eds.), *Changes in Scripture: Rewriting and Interpreting Authoritative Traditions in the Second Temple Period* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011), pp. 321–46.
- Michael, T.S.L., 'Barouch', in A. Pietersma and B.G. Wright (eds.), *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), pp. 925–31.
- Moore, C.A., 'Toward the Dating of the Book of Baruch', *CBQ* 36 (1974), pp. 312–20.
- Mukenge, A.K., *L'unité littéraire du Livre de Baruch* (Ebib 38; Paris: J. Gabalda, 1998).
- Nickelsburg, G.W.E., 'The Bible Rewritten and Expanded', in M.E. Stone (ed.), *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*, vol. II (Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984).
- Pfeiffer, R.H., *History of New Testament Times: With an Introduction to the Apocrypha* (New York: Harper, 1949).
- Salvesen, A., 'Baruch with the Letter of Jeremiah', in M. Goodman (ed.), *The Apocrypha* (The Oxford Bible Commentary; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), pp. 112–19.

- Steck, O.H., *Das Apokryphe Baruchbuch: Studien Zu Rezeption Und Konzentration 'Kanonischer' Überlieferung* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993).
- Thackeray, J.H., 'The Greek Translators of Jeremiah', *JTS* 4 (1903), pp. 245–66.
- Tov, E., *The Book of Baruch: Also Called I Baruch (Greek and Hebrew)* (SBL Texts and Translations Pseudepigrapha Series 8; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975).
- The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch* (HSM 8; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976).
- Wambacq, B.N., 'Les Prières de Baruch (1,15–2,19) et de Daniel (9,5-19)', *Bib* 40 (1959), pp. 463–75.
- Watson, F., *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith* (London: T&T Clark International, 2004).
- Werline, R.A., *Penitential Prayer in Second Temple Judaism: The Development of a Religious Institution* (SBLEJL 13; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998).
- Wright, J.E., *Baruch Ben Neriah: From Biblical Scribe to Apocalyptic Seer* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2003).
- Wright, R.B., 'Psalms of Solomon', in *OTP*, vol. II, pp. 639–70.
- Ziegler, J. (ed.), *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum*. Vol. XV, *Ieremias, Baruch, Threni, Epistula Ieremiae* (2nd ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976 [1957]).

Lamentations

Kevin J. Youngblood

Editions

(a) Standard Greek Editions

Göttingen, vol. XV, *Ieremias, Baruch, Threni, Epistula Ieremiae* (Ziegler, 1976; 2nd ed.).

Rahlfs-Hanhart, vol. II, pp. 756–65.

Swete, vol. III, pp. 360–78.¹

(b) Other Greek Editions

‘A Translation of LXX Lamentations’ (Youngblood, 2011).²

‘La version grecque des Lamentations de Jérémie’ (Assan-Dhôte, 1996).

Vetus Testamentum Græcum, vol. IV (Holmes and Parsons, 1927).

(c) Modern Translations

NETS (Gentry, 2007), pp. 932–41.

LXX.D (Hirsch-Luipold and Maier, 2009), pp. 1349–57.

Bd’A 25.2 (Assan-Dhôte and Moatti-Fine, 2008).

(d) Additional Comments

Some minor alterations to Ziegler’s reconstructed text have been suggested.

Following Rahlfs, Ziegler had omitted the alphabetic labels marking the first

1. Based on Vaticanus, with variants from Alexandrinus, Sinaiticus (only Lam. 1.1–2.20 extant), and Marchalianus presented in an apparatus.

2. The most recent edition of the OG version of Lamentations is a parallel version of the Greek text with a new English translation. This includes all recent modifications to Ziegler’s text and reflects the current state of research on the text of LXX Lamentations, but it lacks an apparatus and textual notes. In that same volume, however, Youngblood gives a brief overview of the nature of the Old Greek version of Lamentations that explains the recent modifications to Ziegler’s reconstruction and their rationale.

four acrostic poems in Lamentations, since in the Greek manuscript tradition the strophe labels *pēh* and *ayin* were in their alphabetic order in the second, third, and fourth poems but without the corresponding strophes. Rahlfs and Ziegler thus concluded that these strophe labels were a later insertion by a scribe who knew the Hebrew alphabet, but had no access to the Hebrew text to understand the labels' relationship to the strophes. Pietersma, however, has pointed out that this fails to account for the correct placement of the strophe labels everywhere else in Greek Lamentations. The better explanation, therefore, is to recognise the mismatched strophe labels as an inner-Greek corruption of the original translation. A later scribe, familiar with the Hebrew alphabet but not familiar with the Hebrew text, would have noticed the discrepancy between the order of the alphabet in ch. 1 and the order in chs. 2–4. It is quite natural to assume that he would have corrected chs. 2–4 to match both ch. 1 and the standard order of the alphabet familiar to him.

The recognition that these strophe labels constitute part of the original translation has led to some other minor modifications to Ziegler's edition that will be discussed in detail below. Some recent editions/translations of LXX Lamentations reflect some or all of these modifications. Assan-Dhôte, for example, includes in parallel columns the Greek text with the alphabetic strophe labels ('La version'). Similarly, Gentry's English translation includes the strophe labels as well as a few other modifications to Ziegler's text (NETS).

I. General Characteristics

Scholars have long recognised that the translator responsible for LXX Lamentations adhered very closely to the Hebrew text. Thackeray, for example, described the translation as a 'literal or unintelligent version (a style akin to that of θ' in many books)' (*Grammar*, p. 13). Though Thackeray's observations were a provisional generalisation based more on intuition than on a translation-technical analysis of various linguistic features (Aejmelaeus, 'What Can We Know', p. 65), his comparison of LXX Lamentations' style with Theodotion (θ') was insightful and anticipated later developments in the study of the nature and text of LXX Lamentations.

Perhaps the best characterisation of the translator's general method is that of quantitative formal equivalence. The translator attempted, as far as possible, to represent every element of the Hebrew text with a corresponding element in Greek; in other words, to render noun for noun,

verb for verb, and particle for particle. The result was often awkward but almost never incomprehensible—an interlinear-style translation to acquaint Hellenistic Jews with the traditional Hebrew text.

Significantly, the translation technique of LXX Lamentations bears a remarkable resemblance to that of the Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Naḥal Ḥever (8HevXIIgr), composed sometime in the first century B.C.E. Barthélemy concluded that 8HevXIIgr was part of a group of recensions and translations of the LXX that were moving toward closer alignment with an emerging standard Hebrew text. He labelled them ‘the καίγε-Theodotion group’ based on their tendency to render the Hebrew particle ׀ג or ׀גג (*gam*, ‘also, indeed’) with the equivalent *kaige* and their similarity to the translation technique of revisions attributed to Theodotion (θ’) (Barthélemy, *Les devanciers*).

Assan-Dhôte (*Bd’A* 25.2) and Youngblood (‘Translation Technique’) have each independently confirmed that LXX Lamentations belongs to the *kaige*-Theodotion group. A danger exists, however, of overestimating the degree of homogeneity of the members of this group and thus skewing perception of the character of LXX Lamentations as an independent translation unit. Youngblood has pointed out that while LXX Lamentations does indeed share many of the characteristics of the *kaige*-Theodotion group, the translation also bears its own unique traits, some of which run counter to *kaige*-Theodotion tendencies.

For example, in places the translator departs from the formal equivalency translation technique so typical of members of this group, especially those places where the translator inserts material not found in the traditional Hebrew text. The best example of this phenomenon is the brief narrative introduction that attributes Lamentations to the prophet Jeremiah and situates its composition shortly after the destruction of Jerusalem in 586 B.C.E. The absence of any extant Hebrew *Vorlage* for this introduction and its similarity to other introductions to laments found elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible suggest that this is the translator’s composition inspired by 2 Chron. 35.25 and modelled after 2 Sam. 1.17 and Ruth 1.1 (Swete, *Introduction*, p. 259; *Bd’A* 25.2, p. 133; Youngblood, ‘Translation Technique’, p. 17).

II. Time and Place of Composition

Two dates have been suggested for the translation of LXX Lamentations. Barthélemy argued that the translation occurred in the first half of the first century B.C.E. since this was the time of the translators/revisers of the *kaige*-Theodotion group (*BGS*, p. 111). His conclusion was based on his dating of 8ḤevXIIgr and on his thesis that these translations/revisions represented an early stage in a process that eventually culminated in the hyper-literalism of the reviser Aquila (α'). Tov's subsequent work on 8ḤevXIIgr, however, indicates that the scroll more likely dates somewhere between 50 B.C.E. and 50 C.E. (*DJD* 8, pp. 22–26). Consequently, LXX Lamentations falls within that same period.

Assan-Dhôte, followed by Alexander ('Cultural History'), argues for an even later date based on her interpretation of Lam. 2.8a. A comparison of the text in the MT and LXX will clarify her argument.

MT 2.8a חשב יהוה להשחית חומת בת-ציון

The LORD intended to destroy the wall of Daughter Zion (author's translation)

LXX 2.8a Καὶ ἐπέστρεψε κύριος τοῦ διαφθεῖραι τεῖχος θυγατρὸς Σιών

And the Lord returned to destroy (or 'again destroyed') the wall of Daughter Zion (author's translation)

The translator mistook the Hebrew חשב ('to think, plan') for the similar השב ('to return, reverse, or repeat'). Assan-Dhôte understands this translation as an interpretation of the Hebrew in light of the destruction of the Second Temple in 70 C.E., arguing that the Greek word ἐπέστρεψε in this context means 'to repeat, to do something again' (*Bd'A* 25.2, p. 169). If this was intended, then the translation must have been produced within the last three decades of the first century.

Assan-Dhôte's theory, however, strains the evidence. While ἐπιστέφω can mean 'to repeat' or 'to do again' this is not its most common meaning, nor for that matter, is this the most natural understanding of what the translator read in Hebrew (*hēšīb*) (*GELS*, p. 222). Her exegesis reads too much into the translator's (mis)interpretation and relies too heavily on the notion that rabbinic exegetical methods underlie the translator's technique. In this she is following Barthélemy, whose work, however, is

highly conjectural and has since been called into question (see Munnich, ‘La Septante’; ‘Indices’).

The translation technique is clearly moving in the direction of greater quantitative alignment with the standard Hebrew text (in the manner of Aquila). At the same time it bears some close affinities with the Greek Psalter which according to most estimates appeared in the mid-second century B.C.E. and initiated many of the translation trends later standardised by the *καίτε*-Theodotion group and systematised by Aquila (Munnich, ‘Indices’; cf. Williams, ‘Towards a Date’, p. 249). LXX Lamentations can be placed along this continuum of translation technique beginning with the Greek Psalter and ending with the extreme formal equivalency of Aquila (ca. 130 C.E.). It is characterised by greater consistency in the use of stereotyped lexical equivalence like Aquila, but falls short of Aquila’s systematic rigidity often preferring equivalents and syntactic structures evident in the Greek Psalter (Youngblood, ‘Translation Technique’, pp. 342–48). In comparison to 8HevXIIgr, LXX Lamentations generally demonstrates greater flexibility in translation. For example, 8HevXIIgr renders the Hebrew verb form *w^eqāṭal* with the Greek future with rigid consistency, while LXX Lamentations alternates between *καί* + aorist and the Greek future (Youngblood, ‘Translation Technique’, p. 342). This indicates that LXX Lamentations likely predates 8HevXIIgr though not by much. Clearly, the issues are complex and precision in dating this translation is impossible. Nonetheless, the evidence indicates that LXX Lamentations fits comfortably between 50 B.C.E. and 50 C.E.

One can only guess at the provenance of LXX Lamentations on the basis of internal clues. Barthélemy’s belief that principles of rabbinic exegesis motivated the translations in this tradition implied a Judean setting, which Assan-Dhôte supported with her belief that the translation was occasioned by the destruction of the Second Temple in 70 C.E. (*Bd’A* 25.2, pp. 159–64). Most scholars, however, have since rejected Barthélemy’s close association of the translation technique of the *kaige*-Theodotion tradition with rabbinic exegesis and, as indicated above, the evidence that LXX Lamentations refers to the Roman razing of Jerusalem is ambiguous at best.

The translator’s rendering of 3.32 reveals a possible clue to the provenance. The MT and LXX are compared below for analysis.

MT 3.32 כִּי אִם־הוּגָה וּרְחַם כָּרַב חֲסָדוֹ

Though he has afflicted, he will take pity according to the magnanimity of his loyal love.

LXX 3.32 ὅτι ὁ ταπεινώσας οἰκτιρήσει κατὰ τὸ πλῆθος τοῦ ἐλέους αὐτοῦ

Because the one who has humbled will take pity according to the riches of his mercy

The translator faithfully rendered *qatal* verb forms in his parent text with aorists. It is therefore remarkable that in this case the verb הוּגָה ('he afflicted') is rendered with an articular participle. Furthermore, the particle אִם has no correspondent in the Greek text, an unusual omission for such an atomistic translator. These oddities can be easily explained as the result of a metathesis and mistake in word division in the translator's parent text. The translator read כִּי אִם הַמוּגָה ('because he who afflicted') instead of כִּי אִם הוּגָה ('though he has afflicted'). This divergence points to a kind of spelling practice found in the Qumran scrolls and other fragments of the Judean desert. If this spelling practice represents a broader phenomenon in the language of Palestine at the turn of the era (Kutscher, *Language*, pp. 8–10), then it may favour a Palestinian provenance but certainty is impossible.

III. Language

When analyzing peculiarities of the syntax of the LXX, divergence from normal Greek style may reflect the bilingualism of the translator rather than the existence of a distinct dialect of Greek. In this regard, Silva (Silva, 'Bilingualism', p. 216) helpfully points out the need to maintain de Saussure's distinction between *langue* (the linguistic system abstracted from actual utterances) and *parole* (actual utterances, especially stylistic variation). In terms of *langue*, the language of LXX Lamentation fits squarely within the syntactical structure of Hellenistic Greek. In terms of *parole*, LXX Lamentations betrays idiosyncratic stylistic variation because it is a translation, and its translator was bilingual. Furthermore, in this particular instance, the translator abides by a translation philosophy that privileges the source text over the target language to such a degree that the result is, by and large, a calque of the Hebrew rather than

a rendition in natural Greek. That is not to say, however, that the end result is not recognisable as Koine Greek.

A good illustration of this phenomenon is the translator's treatment of the Hebrew construct phrase. Out of 119 construct phrases in the parent text, the translator rendered 109 of them with a noun followed by a noun in the genitive case, the closest possible syntactic match in Greek (Youngblood, 'Translation Technique', p. 65).³ While this is a legitimate Koine construction, it is certainly not the preferred surface structure in many of these cases (Thackeray, *Grammar*, p. 23). On the other hand, the translator recognised that in two cases where the *nomen rectum* of the construct phrase modifies the *nomen regens* the genitive construction would obscure the meaning of the Hebrew text. In these cases, the translator broke from his normal practice and rendered the construct state with a noun followed by an attributive adjective—an acceptable Koine construction:

- 4.1b תשתפכנה אבני קדש בראש כל חוצות
4.1b They pour out stones of holiness at the corner of every street.
4.1b ἐξεχύθησαν λίθοι ἅγιοι ἐπ' ἀρχῆς πασῶν ἐξόδων
4.1b They pour out sacred stones at the beginning of all of the exits.
- 4.2b איכה נחשבו לנבלי חרש
4.2b How they are thought of as jars of clay!
4.2b πῶς ἐλογίσθησαν εἰς ἀγγεῖα ὄστράκινα
4.2b How they are reckoned for clay jars!

These examples illustrate that, where strict adherence to the form of the Hebrew text would have interfered with comprehension, concessions were made to the target language.

IV. Translation Features

One must be cautious not to overestimate the degree of homogeneity among members of the *kaige*-Theodotion tradition. Some have suggested, for example, that LXX Lamentations is in fact a product of that

3. The MT of Lamentations actually contains 125 construct phrases but the translator only recognised 119 of them as such; hence, only these are relevant with regard to the translator's technique.

translator or group of translators labelled ‘Theodotion’. Does the translation technique bear this out when compared to revisions attributed to Theodotion?

Barthélemy identified nine core characteristics typical of members of the *kaige*-Theodotion tradition. These are listed in the chart below along with indications of LXX Lamentations’ agreement or disagreement with those traits that are relevant. Characteristics are marked ‘not applicable’ (N/A) when the Hebrew word in question does not occur in MT Lamentations.

<i>Kaige</i> Trait	OG Lam. Agrees	OG Lam. Disagrees	OG Lam. Indet	N/A
וגם/גם » καίγε	×			
Distributive שי » ἀνήρ				×
אנכי » ἔγω εἰμί				×
מעל » ἐπάνωθεν				×
שופר » κερατίνη vs. חצצרה » σάλπιγγξ				×
Absence of Historical Present	×			
אין » οὐκ ἔστιν	×			
לקראת » εἰς συνάντησιν				×
נצב/יצב » στηλόω			×	

Of the nine core characteristics, three are clearly present in LXX Lamentations. In the case of נצב/יצב translated by στηλόω, however, the evidence is ambiguous. On one occasion (3.12) LXX Lamentations has this equivalent but on another occasion (2.4a) נצב/יצב is rendered by the verb στερεόω. In the MT of 2.4a נצב is pointed as Niphal but the translator interpreted it as Qal construing ימינו ‘his right hand’ as the direct object. Quite appropriately he rendered the clause with the verb στερεόω (‘to strengthen; to fix’) recognising that in this context στηλόω (‘to erect a stele/statue’) would be awkward indeed. Thus, the translator of Lamentations was not as consistent with the נצב/יצב » στηλόω equation as other *kaige*-Theodotion translators/revisers were. The most that can be said on the basis of the evidence is that some kind of relationship exists between LXX Lamentations and the *kaige*-Theodotion tradition.

A related issue is whether LXX Lamentations actually is the product of the reviser/translator Theodotion, which Assan-Dhôte has suggested on the basis of certain shared equivalents (*Bd'A* 25.2, pp. 157–59). Origen had indicated that Aquila's and Theodotion's revisions of Lamentations did not survive—only those of Symmachus and 'the Seventy' (Klostermann, *Origenes Werke*, p. 236)—which naturally raises the question whether LXX Lamentations is, in fact, Theodotion. Caution is warranted, however. While Assan-Dhôte's study is insightful, she emphasises the similarities to the neglect of the differences. Furthermore, a great deal more work on the translation technique and nature of Theodotion needs to be done. It is becoming increasingly clear that the collection of readings attributed to Theodotion is not a monolithic revision.

A final observation regarding translational issues in LXX Lamentations is that the translator often passed over well-established equivalents in the LXX tradition in favour of neologisms. No fewer than seven appear in LXX Lamentations:

ἀπωσμός 'rejection' for מרוד 'homelessness, expulsion'

γνοφώ 'to darken' for עוב Hiphil 'to make cloudy, cover with a cloud'

ἔκνηψις 'sobriety' for פוגה 'rest'

ἐπιφυλλίζω 'to glean' for עלל Poel + ל preposition, 'to mistreat, deal harshly with'

καθαρίω 'to purify' for זכה Piel = 'to purify'

ἐγρήγορος 'watchful, wakeful' for עה Niphal 'to be irritated, confused, mentally stirred'

πελειόμαι 'to become pale, be blackened' for III כמר Niphal 'to be black/blackened'

It is difficult to say what motivated these neologisms. Frequently, they render rare words in the Hebrew text and simply represent the translator's effort to render an unfamiliar term by means of whatever associations he could make. Others, however, are attempts to approximate the Hebrew text more faithfully. For example, the translator often turned nouns and adjectives into factitive verbs by means of the -ω termination thus allowing him to maintain an etymological relationship between

nouns/adjectives and verbs in Greek corresponding to similar relationships in Hebrew (עב ‘cloud’, עוב Hiphil ‘cover in cloud’; γνόφος ‘dark’, γνοφώ ‘darken’).

Some neologisms were motivated by a desire to maintain the same sound play in Greek that the translator perceived in Hebrew. The *epsilon* prefixed to the adjective γρήγορος in LXX Lam. 4.14 is best explained as the translator’s attempt at alliteration with the preceding word ἐσαλεύθησαν in order to preserve the sound play of the two Hebrew words נעו עורים (*nā‘û ‘ûrîm*).

Other neologisms were likely motivated by a desire to extend significant metaphors the translator perceived elsewhere in the book or even elsewhere in the prophetic tradition. The odd rendering ἐπιφυλλίζω (‘to glean’) for the Poel of עלל (‘to mistreat/deal harshly with’), for example, introduces the gleaning metaphor from Mic. 7.1; Obad. 1.5; and Jer. 49.9 (LXX 29.10). The equivalents ἔκνηψις ‘sobriety’ for פוגה ‘rest’ and πελειόμαι ‘to become pale, be blackened’ for III כמר Niphal ‘to be black, blackened’ were motivated by their association with drunkenness (cf. LXX Prov. 23.29 for the connection between πελειόμαι and drunkenness) thus extending the metaphor of drinking the cup of wrath/destruction—a metaphor that precedes each of these equivalents by just a few verses (LXX Lam. 2.13; 4.21). Such neologisms are the translator’s way of guiding the readers in making certain etymological and intertextual connections that might otherwise be obscured by translation.

V. Key Text-Critical Issues

Ziegler’s decision to omit the alphabetic labels of the strophes (see § Editions) resulted in other textual decisions in his text that in the light of subsequent research must be reconsidered. The first example is Ziegler’s omission of Lam. 3.22-24, the *hēt* stanza. Ziegler believed that the translator’s eye (or the eye of the scribe responsible for the parent text) accidentally jumped from the end of 3.21 and the end of 3.24 to the nearly identical phrases with which each of these verses ends (3.21, על-כן אוהיל לו vs. על-כן אוהיל לו). As a result everything in between was omitted.

Since the earliest available manuscripts of LXX Lamentations do not contain the three lines, Ziegler’s conclusion is understandable if the

alphabetic labels were not part of the original translation. As noted above (§ Editions), however, the weight of evidence favours the inclusion of the strophe labels as original. Thus, as Pietersma has suggested, the omission of the lines in 19 Greek manuscripts is probably due to inner-Greek corruption. This likelihood is multiplied when one considers that LXX Lam. 3.22 originally opened with $\eta\theta$ and v. 25 opened with $\tau\eta\theta$ (Pietersma, ‘Acrostic’, p. 196). LXX Lam. 3.22-24 should, therefore, be included. The text of these verses can be reconstructed as follows on the basis of the evidence in Ziegler’s apparatus.

$\eta\theta$	<i>Eth</i>
<p>²² τὰ ἐλέη κυρίου ὅτι οὐκ ἐξελίπομεν ὅτι οὐ συνετελέσθησαν οἱ οἰκτιρμοὶ αὐτοῦ</p>	<p>²²These are the mercies of the Lord, that we did not expire, that his compassionate feelings did not cease.</p>
<p>²³ καινὰ εἰς τὰς πρωΐνας πολλὴ ἡ πίστις σου</p>	<p>²³New things emerge every morning. Great is your fidelity.</p>
<p>²⁴ μερίς μου κύριος εἶπεν ἡ ψυχὴ μου διὰ τοῦτο ὑπομενῶ αὐτόν</p>	<p>²⁴My portion is the Lord’, my soul said. Therefore I will wait for him.</p>

Another omission in Ziegler’s text partly attributable to the omission of strophe headings in his reconstruction of LXX Lamentations is 3.29. Obviously, at some point in the transmission of the text, an accidental omission occurred owing to the identical openings of vv. 29 and 30 (both begin with $\eta\theta$, ‘he will give’). Once again, the parablepsis could have just as easily occurred in the Greek transmission as in the Hebrew. Ziegler attributed the Greek rendering of 3.29 to Symmachus and considered the verse to be Hexaplaric since it is mainly attested to by Hexaplaric manuscripts and corresponds closely to the Hebrew.

Ziegler’s judgement fails to take into account how different the Greek of 3.29 is from the usual translation technique of Symmachus. Furthermore, no manuscript attributes the verse to one of the three revisers (NETS, p. 933). One could add to these arguments that the acrostic nature of the poem makes it more likely that scribal error occurred in the transmission of the Greek text since Lamentations 3 is unique in that every line of each three-line strophe begins with the same letter of the Hebrew alphabet. The verse can be reconstructed as follows:

v. 29 δώσει εν χώματι στόμα αὐτοῦ εἰ ἄρα ἐστὶν ἐλπίς⁴

He will place his mouth in dirt mounds if perchance there is hope.

Another case to consider is Ziegler's reconstruction of 3.42. Ziegler begins the verse with *ἡμαρτήσαμεν* ('we sinned') omitting the independent pronoun *ἡμεῖς* ('we') found in the Hexaplaric group (minus Q^{mg}), *L'*, the Catena group, and the Ethiopic version. Ziegler concluded that since the primary text families witnessing to the independent pronoun are generally characterised by expansion and conflation, the pronoun must be a secondary correction toward the Hebrew text. However, the acrostic structure makes the omission unlikely since the three-fold repetition of word-initial *nun* in the *nun* stanza concludes with this modified form of the 1st plural pronoun (ננן). Furthermore, the translator is extremely consistent in rendering independent subject pronouns. Therefore, its omission here is remarkable.

Ziegler also includes the added verb *ἡμαρτήσαμεν* as part of Lam. 3.42. Such additions, however, are uncharacteristic of this translator. Furthermore, as Gentry pointed out, Ziegler recognised that 3.42 echoes other Old Testament passages containing similar confessions of sin and that many of the variants of this verse, found primarily in the *L* group, can be safely attributed to the influence of parallel passages and the *L* group's propensity for conflation. Yet, Ziegler did not apply the same reasoning to *ἡμαρτήσαμεν* which, in the light of the translation's general character, is also the result of conflation (NETS, p. 933).

A final issue regarding 3.42 is that the 2nd person pronoun *σύ* should not be dismissed as secondary. Every other occurrence of the second person independent pronoun in the parent text is rendered in LXX Lamentations by *σύ* (1.21b; 5.19a). Furthermore, Gentry points out that no textual testimony attributes the pronoun to the three revisers (NETS, p. 933). LXX Lam. 3.42 should therefore be reconstructed as follows:

42 Ἡμεῖς ἡσεβήσαμεν καὶ παρεπικράνομεν καὶ σύ οὐκ ἰλάσθης
42 We ourselves transgressed and provoked, and you did not pardon.

4. This reconstruction is based on the Hexaplaric group minus the margin of Q, all of the *L*-group with the exception of 538 (*L'* adds *ὑπομονή* but this is clearly an Antiochian expansion), 239, and Codex Venetus.

Another point of disagreement with Ziegler's text regards his reconstruction of 1.3a:

1.3a-b מנחה יהודה מעני ומרב עבדה היא ישבה בגוים לא מצאה מנוח

1.3a-b Judah went into exile because of oppression and because of the abundance of servitude;

She, she sat among the nations; she found no rest.

Γιμλ

1.3a-b μετακίσθη ἡ Ἰουδαία ἀπὸ ταπεινώσεως αὐτῆς καὶ ἀπὸ πλήθους δουλείας αὐτῆς

ἐκάθισεν ἐν ἔθνεσιν οὐχ εὔρεν ἀνάπαυσιν

Giml

1.3a-b Judea was deported because of her humiliation and because of the abundance of her services; she sat among the nations; she found no rest.

According to Ziegler the translator added αὐτῆς 'her' at the end of 1.3a despite the absence of a 3 f.s. pronominal suffix in the parent text, and then neglected to represent the 3 f.s. independent pronoun at the beginning of 1.3b contrary to his habit of faithfully rendering subject pronouns.

A simple explanation for this apparent divergence from the parent text is that the αὐτῆς at the end of 1.3a was originally the αὐτή 'she' representing the אִיָּה 'she' at the beginning of 1.3b. Later Greek scribes naturally mistook the αὐτή for αὐτῆς which they would have expected to follow δουλείας (because of its parallel ταπεινώσεως αὐτῆς in the preceding clause). Thus, 1.3a-b should be reconstructed as follows (cf. Albrectson, *Studies*, p. 57).

Γιμλ

1.3a-b μετακίσθη ἡ Ἰουδαία ἀπὸ ταπεινώσεως αὐτῆς καὶ ἀπὸ πλήθους δουλείας

αὐτή ἐκάθισεν ἐν ἔθνεσιν οὐχ εὔρεν ἀνάπαυσιν

Giml

1.3a-b Judea was deported because of her humiliation and because of the abundance of services;

she, she sat among the nations; she found no rest.

The final revision to Ziegler's text is once again related to his omission of the alphabetic strophe labels. The text in question is 2.22a.

θαυ

2.22a ἐκάλεσεν ὡς εἰς ἡμέραν ἑορτῆς παροικίας μου κυλόθεν

Thau

2.22a He summoned, as for a day of festivity, my sojourns from all around.

According to Ziegler, the translator's equivalent for אָרָקַת, ἐκάλεσεν, differed from the Hebrew in both tense/aspect and person. Given the consistency with which the translator rendered *yiqtol* verb forms with future tense verbs and *qatal* verb forms with aorist verbs, this rendering would indicate that the translator's parent text likely had אָרָק at the beginning of 2.22a rather than אָרָקַת. Ziegler drew his conclusion on the basis of the testimony of the B group, the A group (with the exception of 106), Syh^{mg}, the Ethiopic version, the Arabic version, and a quotation from Olympiodorus. The rest of the manuscripts, however, have ἐκάλεσας, a reading that Ziegler considers to be a correction toward the Hebrew and, therefore, secondary.

The form אָרָקַת, however, marks the beginning of the *tāw* stanza. It seems unlikely, therefore, that the translator's text was missing the ת prefix. This consideration tilts the scales in favour of the manuscripts containing ἐκάλεσας. The reading Ziegler chose may have arisen within the Greek manuscript tradition as the result of harmonisation with the similar passages in Lam. 1.15b and 2.7c that contain 3rd person forms of this verb. Furthermore, the Lord is referred to in the 3rd person later in 2.22 making a change to the 3rd person in the Greek transmission for the sake of agreement likely.

VI. Ideology and Exegesis

The examples of rabbinic influence in LXX Lamentations (Barthélemy, *Les devanciers*, pp. 148ff.; Assan-Dhôte, 'La version') are speculative and easily attributable to other factors. Assan-Dhôte's assumption of rabbinic exegesis led her to theorise that the translation reappropriates

the text for the situation following the destruction of the Second Temple (cf. Alexander, ‘Cultural History’). This conclusion, however, is not warranted by the evidence.

Rather what one finds in LXX Lamentations are more general and sporadic indications of a developing and mostly subconscious interpretive framework derived from the broader context of Second Temple Judaism. For example, the translator occasionally employed circumlocutions for expressions in the Hebrew text that the translator considered too anthropomorphic or potentially irreverent in reference to God or his Messiah. The rendering of Lam. 4.20 is typical of the technique.

MT 4.20a רוח אפינו משיח יהוה נלכד בשחיתותם

The breath of our nostrils, the Lord’s messiah, was captured in their pits.

LXX 4.20a πνεῦμα προσώπου ἡμῶν χριστὸς κυρίου συνελήμφθη ἐν ταῖς διαφθοραῖς αὐτῶν

The breath of our face, the Lord’s anointed was taken in their destructions.

The Hebrew word אפינו ‘our nostrils’ would more accurately and naturally be rendered by the Greek term *μυκτῆρες* ‘nostrils’. Due to the derisive use of this term in Greek (*μυκτηρίζω* ‘to sneer at, to treat with contempt’), the translator opted for the less offensive *πρόσωπον* ‘face’. The resulting translation reflects a growing trend in Jewish tradition to treat the divine name with special reverence.

A couple of interesting equivalents in LXX Lamentations may reflect the influence of Second Temple eschatology. The difference between the MT and LXX in Lam. 2.22 is striking.

MT

תקרא כיום מועד מגורי מסביב
ולא היה ביום אף־יהוה פליט ושריד
אשר־טפחתי ורביתי איבי כלם

You summoned, as on the day of an appointed feast, my terrors from every side.

And there was not, on the day of the Lord’s wrath, a single survivor or fugitive.

Those whom I bore and reared my enemies annihilated.

θαυ

ἐκάλεσας ὡς εἰς ἡμέραν ἑορτῆς παροικίας μου κυκλόθεν,
καὶ οὐκ ἐγένετο ἐν ἡμέρᾳ ὀργῆς κυρίου
ἀνασφύζομενος καὶ καταλελειμμένος
ὡς ἐπεκράτησα καὶ ἐπλήθυνα ἐχθρούς μου πάντας.

Thau

He summoned, as for a day of festivity, my sojourns from all around,
and there was not on the day of the Lord's wrath one who is spared or is
left (alive)
as I overpowered and increased all of my enemies.

It appears the translator read מגורי as 'my sojourns' instead of as 'my terrors' as though it were derived from the root גור 'to sojourn' instead of from the root גור 'to be afraid'. Though this is certainly a possible interpretation of the text, it is a remarkable choice given the translator's association of Lamentations with the prophet Jeremiah who repeatedly used the phrase 'terror on every side' that occurs here (cf. Jer. 6.25; 20.3, 10; 46.5; 49.29). Furthermore the translator read טפחתי 'I bore (a child/children)' as though it read טבחתי 'I slaughter/kill off', a confusion of letters he made at 2.20c as well. This confusion could have been reflected in the translator's parent text or could have been made by the translator, especially in the light of the presence of the root טבח in the immediate context (Lam. 2.21c). Finally, the translator read the verb + pronominal suffix כולם 'he annihilated them' as the noun + pronominal suffix *kullām* 'all of them'. The resulting translation gives an entirely different sense from the original. Whereas the Hebrew reflects the totality of Jerusalem's devastation in the wake of Nebuchadnezzar's invasion in 586 B.C.E., the Greek reflects Judah's return from exile and her victory over her enemies—a common eschatological theme in Second Temple literature. Whether this divergence from the Hebrew parent text was deliberate or unconscious is impossible to say for certain.

Another, less dramatic example can be found in LXX Lam. 5.20:

MT 5.20 למה לנצח תשכחנו תעזבנו לארך ימים

Why would you forget us forever? Will you forsake us days without end?

LXX 5.20 ἵνα τί εἰς νίκης ἐπιλήσῃ ἡμῶν, καταλείψεις ἡμᾶς εἰς μακρότητα ἡμερῶν;

Why with respect to victory will you forget us? Will you forsake us for length of days?

The Hebrew text contains the temporal modifier לְנֶצַח meaning ‘forever’. LXX Lamentations, however, reflects a later meaning attested in the Dead Sea Scrolls: εἰς νίκης meaning ‘for/with respect to victory’ (Qimron, *Hebrew*, p. 111; cf. 1QM 16.9 for evidence of the root נִצַּח conveying the idea of eschatological victory). This term came to be associated in Second Temple Judaism with the eschatological victory of God and his people over their enemies (e.g., 1QM, especially column 16; see Caird, ‘Toward’, p. 24). The text betrays belief in a final and eternal victory of God and his people over their enemies—a belief that was frequently attested in the Second Temple period as indicated in this text.

The translator’s boldest and most significant interpretive move is the prologue added to the translation, attributing the words to Jeremiah after the capture of Jerusalem. This introduction reframes the entire book giving it a context and an author that it does not have in the Hebrew text. The effect was to bring Lamentations into alignment with other additions to the book of Jeremiah in the Greek tradition (Baruch and The Epistle of Jeremiah) as well as to bolster the book’s authority by associating it with an acknowledged prophet. One cannot help but read the text differently in the light of this introduction. For example, the first person voice in the MT Lamentations 1 is the voice of personified Zion. In LXX Lamentations, however, it is clearly the voice of Jeremiah. The same is true of Lamentations 3 which in the MT features an anonymous masculine voice, perhaps a Davidic figure. In the LXX, however, the speaker is clearly Jeremiah.

With the exception of these interpretive aspects of LXX Lamentations, however, the translator simply conveyed the message of the Hebrew text as well as possible in Greek. No consistent, systematic, or deliberate interpretive agenda is evident.

VII. Reception History

LXX Lamentations made a minimal impact on early Rabbinic Judaism. The translator’s introduction to the book did influence the targumist who expanded it and placed it at the beginning of the Targum of Lamentations. The two introductions are placed side by side below for comparative purposes.

LXX

And it happened after Israel was exiled and Jerusalem was desolated that Jeremiah sat weeping and he voiced this lament over Jerusalem and said... (author's translation)

Targum

Jeremiah, the Prophet and High Priest, told how it was decreed against Jerusalem and against her people that they would be punished by banishments, and that eulogy would be made over them by Lamentations. Just as Adam and Eve, who were punished, banished from the garden of Eden, and over whom the Lord of the Universe eulogised with Lamentations. The Attribute of Justice reported her great sinfulness, and she was evicted (Levine, *Aramaic*, p. 63).

Even within Christian circles, however, LXX Lamentations seldom played a major role in subsequent biblical interpretation or the formation of church doctrine. No clear quotations or allusions to LXX Lamentations appear in the New Testament. One could possibly argue that LXX Lam. 4.20 in some sense informed John's account of Jesus' breathing on his disciples while saying 'Receive the Holy Spirit' in Jn 20.22, but no strong verbal similarities connect the two texts.

Probably the earliest quotation of LXX Lamentations occurs in Irenaeus's *Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching* (71; ca. 180 C.E.). Irenaeus quotes Lam. 4.20, 'The Spirit of our face, the Lord Christ, was taken in their snares; of whom we said, "Under his shadow we shall live among the Gentiles"'. He refers to this text in order to make the point that though Christ was 'Spirit of God', he became human. He draws this inference from the word 'shadow', because a shadow can only be cast by a body, not by a spirit. The nature of the text that Irenaeus quoted, however, is difficult to determine because this work only survived in Armenian translation. His attribution of the quotation to Jeremiah, however, indicates that he is drawing the reference from the LXX tradition.

Irenaeus set a significant precedent by appealing to LXX Lam. 4.20 in his development of a doctrine of the Holy Spirit and the incarnation. This verse more than any other from LXX Lamentations arrested the attention of the Church Fathers largely owing to its use of the messianic title *χρίστος κυρίου* in conjunction with the word *πνεῦμα*.

Origen composed a verse-by-verse commentary on Lamentations, only fragments of which have survived. Origen takes his typical allegorical approach interpreting Jerusalem as an image of the soul that must suffer in order to be reborn. Olympiodorus of Alexandria followed this same line of allegorical interpretation in his commentary on the Greek text of Lamentations, after asserting that the historical destruction of the Second Temple was God's punishment for the Jews' execution of Christ (*Bd'A* 25.2, pp. 182–83). Theodoret of Cyrus, however, returned to a more historical line of interpretation in his commentary on the Antiochene text of LXX Lamentations.

Generally speaking patristic interpretation of LXX Lamentations is characterised by selective attention to passages that lend themselves to connections with events in the life of Christ or to texts whose language was suggestive of emerging doctrinal formulations employed in combating Christological heresies.

Bibliography

- Aejmelaeus, A., 'What Can We Know about the Hebrew *Vorlage* of the Septuagint?', *ZAW* 99 (1987), pp. 58–89.
- Albrektson, B., *Studies in the Text and Theology of Lamentations with a Critical Edition of the Peshitta Text* (Studia Theologica Lundensia 21; Lund: Gleerup, 1963).
- Alexander, P.S., 'The Cultural History of the Ancient Bible Versions: The Case of Lamentations', in N. de Lange, J.G. Krivoruchko and C. Boyd-Taylor (eds.), *Jewish Reception of Greek Bible Versions: Studies in Their Use in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), pp. 78–102.
- Assan-Dhôte, I., 'Le texte antiochien du livre des Lamentations: tradition écrite, traditions orales', in G. Dorival and O. Munnich (eds.), *Kata tous O' selon les Septante* (Festschrift M. Harl; Paris: Cerf, 1995), pp. 187–206.
- 'La version grecque des Lamentations de Jérémie' (Ph.D. dissertation, Université de Paris-Sorbonne, 1996).
- Assan-Dhôte, I., and J. Moatti-Fine (eds.), *La Bible d'Alexandrie*. Vol. XXV.2, *Baruch, Lamentations, Lettre de Jérémie* (Paris: Cerf, 2005).
- Caird, G.B., 'Toward a Lexicon of the Septuagint, II', *JTS* (1969), pp. 21–40.
- Gentry, P.J., 'Lamentations', in A. Pietersma and B.G. Wright (eds.), *A New English Translation of the Septuagint* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), pp. 932–41.
- Klostermann, E., *Origenes Werke*, Dritter Band, *Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1983).

- Kutscher, E.Y., *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Complete Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa^a)* (Leiden: Brill, 1974).
- Labahn, A., 'Bitterkeit und Asche als Speise—das Leiden Jeremias am Schicksal Jerusalems: Metaphern und Metaphervariationen in Thr 3,1-21 LXX', in P. van Hecke (ed.), *Metaphor in the Hebrew Bible* (BETL 187; Leuven: Peeters, 2005), pp. 147–83.
- Levine, É., *The Aramaic Version of Lamentations* (New York: Hermon, 1976, 1981).
- Munnich, O., 'Indices d'une Septante originelle dans le Psautier Grec', *Bib* 63 (1982), pp. 406–16.
- 'La Septante des Psaumes et le Group Kaige', *VT* 33 (1983), pp. 75–89.
- Pietersma, A., 'The Acrostic Poems of Lamentations in Greek Translation', in L. Greenspoon and O. Munnich (eds.), *VIII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Paris 1992* (SBLSCS; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995), pp. 183–201.
- Qimron, E., *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (HSS 29; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986).
- Silva, M., 'Bilingualism and the Character of Palestinian Greek', *Bib* 61 (1980), pp. 198–219.
- Williams, T., 'Towards a Date for the Greek Psalter', in R.J.V. Hiebert, C.E. Cox, and P.J. Gentry (eds.), *The Old Greek Psalter* (Festschrift A. Pietersma; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), pp. 248–76.
- Youngblood, K.J., 'Appendix 1: A Translation of LXX Lamentations', in R. Parry and H. Thomas (eds.), *Great Is Thy Faithfulness? Toward Reading Lamentations as Christian Scripture* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2011), pp. 211–27.
- 'The Character and Significance of LXX Lamentations', in R. Parry and H. Thomas (eds.), *Great Is Thy Faithfulness? Toward Reading Lamentations as Christian Scripture* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2011), pp. 64–69.
- 'Translation Technique in the Greek Lamentations' (Ph.D. dissertation, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2004).
- Ziegler, J. (ed.), *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum*. Vol. XV, *Jeremias, Baruch, Threni, Epistula Ieremiae* (2nd ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976 [1957]).

Epistle of Jeremiah

Benjamin G. Wright

Editions

(a) Standard Greek Editions

Göttingen, vol. XV, *Ieremias, Baruch, Threni, Epistula Ieremiae* (Ziegler, 1976; 2nd ed.).

Rahlfs-Hanhart, vol. II, pp. 766–69.

Swete, vol. III, pp. 379–84.

(b) Modern Translations

NETS (Wright, 2007), pp. 942–45.

LXX.D (Kraus, 2009), pp. 1358–61.

Bd'A 25.2 (Assan-Dhôte and Moatti-Fine, 2008).

I. General Characteristics

Jews in the Second Temple period possessed a variety of traditions about the prophet Jeremiah, which included the Epistle of Jeremiah (Ep. Jer.), *Paraleipomena of Jeremiah* (4 Baruch), 2 Macc. 2.1-4, 4QApocryphon of Jeremiah and traditions about the prophet reported in Eupolemus. Ep. Jer. is a short text, consisting of a scant 73 verses. It was originally an independent composition, and in some Septuagint manuscripts it appears as a separate work among the Jeremiah texts, usually in the order Jeremiah, Baruch, Lamentations and Ep. Jer. In other manuscripts, as well as in the Syriac and Latin, the work follows immediately after Baruch. After the time of Jerome, it was absorbed into the book of Baruch as ch. 6. The most important critical question connected with Ep. Jer. concerns whether it was originally composed in Greek or translated from a Hebrew or Aramaic *Vorlage* (§ IV).

II. Time and Place of Composition

Scholars have focused on two primary pieces of external evidence to determine a date for the Greek text. First, a small fragment of Ep. Jer. was found at Qumran (7Q2) consisting of 22 full or partial letters. The extant text comports with Ziegler's Lucianic text and the Syriac translation. M. Baillet, J.T. Milik and R. de Vaux (DJD III) suggest a date of approximately 100 B.C.E. for the fragment. Second, 2 Macc. 2.2 (late second to first century B.C.E.) reports that Jeremiah 'commanded those who were being deported not to forget the ordinances of the Lord or to be led astray in their thoughts on seeing the gold and silver statues and their adornment' (NETS). This sentence recalls the beginning of Ep. Jer. and could be an allusion to it. 2 Maccabees contains no linguistic markers that would make this identification definite, however, and the surrounding material, of which v. 2 is a piece, could not have come from Ep. Jer. Even if 2 Maccabees is not directly dependent on Ep. Jer., the two texts clearly share the same tradition, and, combined with the date of the Qumran fragment, a second-century B.C.E. date for the Greek seems most probable. The study of Naumann ('Untersuchungen') confirms this timeframe (§ III).

Scholars who think that Ep. Jer. was composed in Hebrew (or Aramaic) look to v. 2 as a clue to the date of the presumed Semitic original. There the author warns the deportees to expect a long stay in Babylon, 'as long as seven generations'. This time period would ostensibly reflect the reality that the biblical prophet Jeremiah's prophecy of a restoration after seventy years (29.10) had proven to be incorrect (Moore, *The Additions*, p. 328). Calculating 40 years in a generation, the span of time from the first deportation to Babylon to the letter would arrive at about 317 B.C.E. Nothing in the text, however, warrants such a specific calculation. Still, in light of the date of the Greek, if a Hebrew original did exist, it would probably date to sometime in the third century B.C.E.

Ep. Jer.'s provenance is also difficult to ascertain with certainty. The letter addresses 'those who would be led as captives into Babylon' (v. 1), which presumes Palestine as the place of composition. The text focuses on Mesopotamian religions, and the only god directly named is Bel (v. 40). Other cultic references reflect at least some acquaintance with Babylonian religious practices connected with the worship of Tammuz,

although they are not detailed enough to make a Babylonian provenance certain (Moore, *The Additions*, p. 329). The letter displays no influence or knowledge of Egyptian cultic practices. The greatest likelihood is that Ep. Jer. originated in Palestine, although Babylon remains a possibility.

III. Language

In 1913, Naumann undertook a detailed study of the Koine character of Ep. Jer.'s Greek, and he concluded that it compared favourably with other Hellenistic Koine texts ('*Untersuchungen*', p. 44). As a general assessment, Ep. Jer.'s Greek contains few linguistic markers of translation Greek, and it differs from other translated books in the LXX/OG corpus in several significant ways: (a) it abounds in connecting particles, such as $\tau\epsilon$ or $\sigma\upsilon\nu$, that occur much less frequently in undisputed translations (NETS, p. 943); (b) the author uses parataxis much less than most translated books; (c) it contains few uses of structure words, such as prepositions, that fall outside of idiomatic Greek usage; (d) it employs verbal adjectives, which do not occur in other translated books, primarily because they have no counterpart in Hebrew; (e) it frequently interposes words or phrases between elements that cannot be separated in Hebrew, such as the definite article and the noun it governs; (f) it uses words and phrases that do not occur elsewhere in the LXX/OG corpus or are very rare (Wright, 'Epistle'). All of these features cohere with Naumann's determination that Ep. Jer. fits well into the framework of Koine Greek.

IV. Translation and Composition

In general, nineteenth-century scholars argued that Ep. Jer. was an original Greek composition. In the early twentieth century, however, Ball made a detailed case for translation ('Epistle'). Almost contemporaneously with Ball, Naumann published his study of the Koine features of Ep. Jer., but despite his results, he also decided that the work was translated. Most subsequent scholarship has accepted this conclusion. Moore presents three general lines of evidence that recent scholarship has relied on to prove that Ep. Jer. had a Semitic original: (a) 'the presence of corrupt Greek readings which presuppose a particular Hebrew word of two very different meanings and where the Greek translator obviously

chose the wrong one'; (b) 'instances where variant readings are probably best explained by positing a Hebrew original'; (c) 'the presence of other types of Hebraisms, including the repeated use of the Greek future tense for the present, and the literalistic rendering of such distinctive Hebrew constructions as the infinitive absolute' (*The Additions*, p. 326).

The passages brought forward as clinching evidence for translation seem much less probative if viewed from the perspective of composition, however (Wright, 'Epistle'). An example from each of Moore's three categories will illustrate the complex nature of the problem.

(a) After observing how the Gentiles adorn their idols 'like human beings', Ep. Jer. reads: οὔτοι δὲ οὐ διασώζονται ἀπὸ ἰοῦ καὶ βρωμάτων 'but they are not kept safe from rust and food' (v. 11). Moore (*The Additions*, p. 338) takes the word βρώματα 'food' to be a misreading of the 'original' Hebrew, which would have had the consonants מַאֲכָל. The translator read them as *ma^akal* 'food', instead of *me^okel* 'from a devourer' or perhaps 'moth' (cf. LXX Mal. 3.11).

Yet, this seemingly odd use of βρῶμα can be accommodated within the framework of composition. Naumann long ago suggested one way to understand it. Although the word βρῶμα in Classical Greek always connoted 'food' or 'bread', when used with ἰός in this passage βρώματα must mean something like 'corruption, decay', a meaning found in Hippocrates and Dioscorides, where the term connotes decay (of a tooth) or a cancerous sore. Pseudo-Galen (second century C.E.) uses the word as 'foul smell' or 'filth'. Based on a lexicographical approach to the text, Naumann suggested that the use of βρῶμα in Ep. Jer. 11 'contains the oldest and sole evidence from the older literature for the later Greek use of the word' ('Untersuchungen', p. 36).

Even if the meaning of 'food' is retained, the larger argument of the work provides a meaningful context. Verses 7-14 begin by claiming that the tongues of idols, which are made of wood and overlaid with gold and silver, are smoothed over, but they are still unable to speak. Furthermore, the priests purloin the idols' adornment in order to spend the gold and silver on themselves and on prostitutes. Verse 10 ends with the parenthetical phrase 'gods of silver and gold and wood'. Verse 11 follows: 'But they are not kept safe from rust and βρώματα'. The 'they' of v. 11 are the *gods* of silver and gold and wood, and the deleterious effects of rust and βρώματα apply to them. 'Rust' would then apply to the metals,

and βρώματα to the wood. The use of βρῶμα here would anticipate the claim of v. 19 that ‘creeping things’ devour (κατεσθόντων) the wooden idols from the inside out. The author, then, establishes a parallel between metals, which corrode, and wood, which is food for vermin (Wright, ‘Epistle’). Whichever explanation of βρῶμα is preferred, neither requires a misreading of some unknown Hebrew text.

(b) Verse 54 reads: ‘For like crows between heaven and earth they are’ (ὡσπερ γὰρ κορώναι ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς). Because of the seemingly inapposite nature of the image, Ball invoked the Syriac translation, which reads ‘like ravens’, *kʿrbym*. On this basis, he argued that the ‘original’ Hebrew must have been *kʿbym* ‘like the clouds’, which the Greek translator misread (‘Epistle’, p. 608). Yet, by all accounts, the Syriac translation was made from the Greek, and in that case, the reading ‘like the ravens’ represents the Syriac translator’s understanding of the Greek ‘crows’. Any resemblance to the Hebrew ‘clouds’ would be coincidental (and largely beside the point). What the image means in the context must be addressed at the level of the Greek text, a matter complicated by the fact that this verse does not have a clear relationship to the surrounding context.

(c) Verse 4 contains a passage that scholars have argued renders the Hebrew infinitive absolute: ‘Beware, therefore, lest you too, having been made like the allophyles, become like them’ (εὐλαβήθητε οὖν μὴ καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀφομοιωθέντες τοῖς ἀλλοφύλοις ἀφομοιωθῆτε), with the two uses of the verb ἀφομοιόω representing the Hebrew construction. Two arguments militate against this view. First, the two elements in the Hebrew infinitive absolute, an infinitive and a finite verb, come directly in sequence with no words between them. In Ep. Jer. the phrase τοῖς ἀλλοφύλοις separates the participle and verb, thus violating Hebrew word order. Moreover, the passage does not comport with the usual rendering of the infinitive absolute elsewhere in the Septuagint, where the two elements generally remain adjacent to one another (cf., for example, Gen. 2.17; Deut. 13.10). Second, the use of the participle and finite verb from the same root can just as easily be understood as an example of paronomasia, a play on words, a common feature of Greek rhetoric (Wright, ‘Epistle’).

Scholars adduce one other passage as clinching evidence that Ep. Jer. was a translation. In v. 69 the phrase ‘a scarecrow in a cucumber field’ appears to have derived from the Hebrew text of Jer. 10.5, since it does

not occur in the LXX of Jeremiah. Yet, even if one assumes that the author knew the phrase from the Hebrew of Jeremiah (and there are other possibilities), its appearance in Ep. Jer. shows only that the author knew Hebrew; it does not prove that the entire work is a translation.

When all the evidence is examined together, and if one adopts the perspective of possible composition in Greek, the case for translation is much less straightforward than recent scholars have acknowledged, and composition in Greek seems a distinct possibility, perhaps even a likelihood. At best the evidence is mixed or inconclusive.

V. Key Text-Critical Issues

Since Ep. Jer. was transmitted as part of the larger Septuagint corpus, it was rendered into the various daughter versions. The most important for Ep. Jer. are the Old Latin, Syro-Hexapla, Syriac (Peshitta) and Arabic, all of which follow the Greek rather closely, although the Peshitta is a bit freer than the rest, including what appear to be attempts to make the Greek clearer or more understandable. As a rule, the versions do not offer much assistance in understanding the Greek text.

VI. Ideology and Exegesis

Although v. 1 identifies it as a letter, Ep. Jer. polemicises against and ridicules idols and idol worship. Its inspiration almost certainly came from Jeremiah's letter to the exiles preserved in Jeremiah 29. Moore characterises it as a 'tirade' (*Daniel*, p. 317), and Clifford as an 'extended diatribe' ('Letter', p. 1460). The text is organised into ten strophes, all except the first ending with a similar refrain that encourages the addressees not to fear these so-called gods (cf. vv. 14, 22, 28, 39, 44, 51, 56, 64, 68), followed by a concluding section. No clear pattern or development of thought emerges in this short text. While Ep. Jer. evinces the influence of a range of earlier anti-idolatry texts (cf. Deut. 4.27-28; Isa. 46.6-7; Pss. 115.3-8; 134[135].15-17), it most closely resembles Jer. 10.2-15, which served as its springboard. The author offers a simplistic view of gentile idolatry in which he equates the idol with the god it represents, a view it shares with other Jewish anti-idolatry texts, such as Bel and the Dragon and the Wisdom of Solomon, even though it

caricatures Greek and Roman thinking about the nature of physical representations of deities. Seeking to explain why the Jews should not regard idols as real, several strophes form variations on the major theme of the work: idols are helpless and cannot maintain, protect or defend themselves, let alone benefit any human being. So, for example, the author observes, ‘Gods made of wood and overlaid with silver and gold will not be safe either from thieves or from bandits, the strong of whom will strip away the gold and silver, and they make off with the clothing they wear. Nor shall they help themselves’ (vv. 56-57).

VII. Reception History

Although Ep. Jer. was regarded as canonical by many Church Fathers and accepted into the Christian scriptures, some dissented, most notably Jerome, who called it a *pseudepigraphon*. It seems to have had no clear or direct influence on later Jewish texts and little on Christian authors. The second-century *Apology* of Aristides appears to have known it, although it is not quoted directly. Tertullian (*Scorp.* 8) cites vv. 3-5, attributing the words to Jeremiah, and Cyprian’s *Dom. orat.* 5 contains what could possibly be a loose version of v. 5. Firmicus Maternus (fourth century) quotes extensive sections of Ep. Jer. in *The Error of Pagan Religions* 28.

Bibliography

- Assan-Dhôte, I., and J. Moatti-Fine (eds.), *La Bible d’Alexandrie*. Vol. XXV.2, *Baruch, Lamentations, Lettre de Jérémie* (Paris: Cerf, 2005).
- Ball, C.J., ‘Epistle of Jeremy’, in *APOT*, I, pp. 596–611.
- Clifford, R.J., ‘The Letter of Jeremiah: Introduction and Notes’, in H.W. Attridge (ed.), *Harper Collins Study Bible* (rev. ed.; San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 2006), pp. 1460–65.
- deSilva, D.A., ‘Letter of Jeremiah’, in *Introducing the Apocrypha* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002), pp. 214–21.
- Gunnweg, A.H.J., ‘Das Buch Baruch’, in W.G. Kümmel *et al.* (eds.), *Unterweisung in lehrhafter Form* (JSHRZ 3.2; Gütersloh: Mohn, 1975).
- Moore, C.A., *Daniel, Esther, and Jeremiah: The Additions* (AB 44; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1977), pp. 317–58.

- Naumann, W., 'Untersuchungen über den apokryphen Jeremiasbrief', *BZAW* 13 (1913), pp. 1–53.
- Wright, B.G., 'The Epistle of Jeremiah: Translation or Composition?', in G.G. Xeravits and J. Zsengellér (eds.), *Deuterocanonical Additions to the Old Testament Books: Selected Studies* (DCLS 5; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010), pp. 126–42.
- 'Letter of Ieremias, Introduction and Translation', in A. Pietersma and B.G. Wright (eds.), *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under That Title* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), pp. 942–45.
- Ziegler, J. (ed.), *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum*. Vol. XV, *Ieremias, Baruch, Threni, Epistula Ieremiae* (2nd ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976).

Ezekiel

Katrin Hauspie

Editions

(a) Standard Greek Editions

Göttingen, vol. XVI.1, *Ezechiel* (Ziegler and Fraenkel, 1977; 2nd ed.).

Rahlfs-Hanhart, vol. II, pp. 770–863.

Swete, vol. III, pp. 385–97.

(b) Other Greek Editions

Vetus Testamentum Græcum (Holmes and Parsons, 1798–1827).

Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes (Tischendorf, 1887–1894).

(c) Modern Translations

NETS (Hubler, 2007), pp. 946–85.

LXX.D (Hammerstaedt-Löhr *et al.*, 2009), pp. 1363–1416.

(d) Additional Comments

The manuscript 967, discovered in 1931, is an important pre-Hexaplaric witness to the OG (see § I.a) but has been published in disparate locations owing to the different places where it is conserved (Dublin, Princeton, Madrid, Cologne): Fernández-Galiano, ‘Nuevas páginas’; Jahn, *Der griechische Text*; Johnson *et al.*, *The John H. Scheide Biblical Papyri*; Kenyon, *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri*, VII.

I. General Characteristics

a. Transmission

The Greek text of the book of Ezekiel has come to us by the main uncials Vaticanus (B, fourth century) and Alexandrinus (A, fifth century), further by the Marchalianus (Q, sixth century), the Venetus (V, eighth century) and the Zuqninensis (Z^v, sixth, seventh, eighth century), and by about

forty minuscules (from the ninth till the fourteenth century). Ezekiel is not preserved in Sinaiticus. The oldest witness, besides some scant fragments from Qumran, is papyrus 967 (hereafter 967) of Egyptian origin, dating from the late second–early third century. The leaves containing Ezek. 1.1–11.24 are missing. Besides the Greek text of Ezekiel, the Greek text of Daniel, Susanna, Bel and the Dragon, and Esther also belong to this papyrus.

Papyrus 967 is a very important witness to the text of Ezekiel, as it reflects a pre-Hexaplaric text. Together with B (which already shows an attempt to bring the Greek in line with the Hebrew text), 967 represents the Old Greek, a Greek text not yet affected by the Hexaplaric readings. At the time Ziegler prepared his Göttingen edition (1952), only the leaves of 967 known as the Chester Beatty Papyri (ed. Kenyon) and the John H. Scheide Papyri (ed. Johnson, Gehman and Kase) were available, allowing Ziegler to incorporate 967 for the relevant chapters, including most of chs. 11–17 and parts of chs. 19–39. In 1977 Fraenkel added the readings of 967 published by Fernández-Galiano ('Nuevas páginas') and Jahn (*Der griechische Text*) in the *Nachtrag* to the revised Göttingen edition.

Besides the B-text, reflected in B and 967, the Greek Ezekiel is also represented by the A-text, with its main witness A, and by the Hexaplaric recension, with its representatives Q, MS 88 (or the *Chisianus*), the Syro-Hexapla and Jerome's Latin translation of the Greek Ezekiel. The Lucianic recension is another important text group, mainly represented by the Greek text found in the Ezekiel commentaries of Theodoret of Cyrus (a fifth-century bishop), Chrysostom and ZV.

b. Translation Style

The Greek translation of the book of Ezekiel is relatively literal, aiming to be word-for-word (Marquis, 'Word Order', pp. 59–84; Sollamo, *Renderings*). Because of the literal character, differences between the Greek version and the MT most probably reflect another Hebrew *Vorlage* and are not to be attributed to the translator. The Greek text compared to the extant MT offers a slightly shorter version (4–5% shorter than the MT) and a variety of recensional differences (Tov, 'Recensional', pp. 89–101). For example, Greek Ezek. 7.1–11 contains a longer minus and

some transposition of the verses relative to the MT (Bogaert, 'Les deux rédactions', pp. 21–47; Lust, 'Use', pp. 17–20; Lust *et al.*, 'Notes', pp. 384–87). In the MT, the insertion of the *sefira* (Ezek. 7.7, 10)—the cryptic figure alluding to the *sefir* or he-goat in Daniel (8.5) and to Antiochus IV—represents a plus and transposition not reflected in the Greek. It is likely that the Greek version reflects a shorter Hebrew *Vorlage* that differs from the MT, indicating that the MT represents a further stage of development (Lust, 'Use', pp. 17–19). The important Papyrus 967 has three additional longer minuses: Ezek. 12.26–28; 32.25–26; and 36.23b–38; they all represent witnesses to an earlier Hebrew text. These sections, composed of materials found elsewhere in Ezekiel, were added to the MT to play down the apocalyptic tendencies in this book (Lust, 'Major Divergences', p. 90). The minuses of the Septuagint thus reflect recensional activities of the editors of the MT. Some longer pluses are to be found in the Septuagint, without text-critical or exegetical interests (e.g., Ezek. 5.2; 10.2; 24.14; 40.7–8), except for Ezek. 43.3, which betrays a clear theological orientation (Lust, 'And I Shall Hang Him', pp. 201–17).

In sum, 967 supports the widely held view that the Greek of Ezekiel represents an earlier redactional stage of the Hebrew text than the MT (Lust, 'Ezekiel 36–40', p. 529; Tov, *Text-Critical*, p. 250; Lilly, *Two Books*). The Hebrew Ezekiel scroll found at Masada, dated to the second half of the first century B.C.E., contains Ezek. 36.23c–38, which is missing in 967. It represents a proto-MT, different from the *Vorlage* of 967. It appears that different versions of the Hebrew text (reflected in the longer MT and the shorter Greek text) were in existence at the same time (Patmore, 'Shorter', pp. 231–42). In this respect 967 is not necessarily a witness to a Hebrew text earlier than the MT, but of the existence of differing Hebrew versions.

c. Homogeneity

In 1903 Thackeray questioned the homogeneity of the Greek version of Ezekiel. By analogy to the mechanical partitioning of Greek Jeremiah into approximately equal parts for translational reasons, he divides the Greek version of Ezekiel into three parts, attributed to two translators: α = Ezek. 1–27, β = Ezek. 28–39, γ = Ezek. 40–48, with α and γ

betraying the hand of a single translator, β of a different one. He isolated within β Ezek. 36.23b-38, $\beta\beta$, marked by a third style closely resembling that of Theodotion (Thackeray, ‘Greek Translators’, pp. 398–411; *Septuagint*, p. 37). The different rendering of צר of the MT by Σορ in α and by Τύρος in β (it is absent from γ) drew his attention to the change in the Greek style. After dividing the work into two nearly equal parts regardless of the subject-matter (i.e., chs. 26, 27 in α and ch. 28 in β deal with Tyre), the first half of the book was attributed to one translator, who also took the last quarter including the hardest parts of Ezekiel; this translator is also possibly responsible for (the main part of) the Minor Prophets and parts of the third book of Reigns. The second translator, before starting the second half of the book of Ezekiel, read over the last portion of the work of his predecessor, and inserted some corrections of his own. This explains the mixture of the two vocabularies in chs. 26 and 27. The break before the third section coincides with a break in the subject-matter.

Other views of the divisions and translators of Greek Ezekiel have been proposed on different criteria. Based on the translation of the divine name, Schäfers (‘Ist das Buch’, pp. 289–91) identified three sections: Ezekiel 1–11 (κύριος), Ezek. 12–39 (κύριος, κύριος) and Ezekiel 40–48 (κύριος ὁ θεός). In contrast, Herrmann (‘Gottesnamen’) used the same criteria to isolate identical sections to those of Thackeray, but attributable to three translators rather than two. N. Turner (‘Greek Translators’, p. 12) proposed another variant of the three translator theory on the basis of grammatical phenomena and vocabulary: Ezekiel 1–25, Ezekiel 26–39 and Ezekiel 40–48. Muraoka (‘Re-examination’, p. 9) supports the two translator theory, in agreement with the division of Thackeray, while McGregor (*Greek Text*, pp. 197–98) suggests that two translators were responsible for the three sections defined by N. Turner. There is also the theory of one translator and different sections. After the publication of 967, where the divine name in most cases appears as $\kappa\bar{\varsigma}$, the double name thus being of a later date, Ziegler contended that the double name is due to a revision of the Greek text, not to multiple translators (‘Die Bedeutung’, pp. 93–94). According to Barthélemy the section β shows a pre-kaige recensional approach, by which צר is translated by καὶ γάρ (*Les devanciers*, pp. 42–43, 47). Tov qualifies sections β and γ as

revisions (*Septuagint Translation*, p. 150). P.D.M. Turner ('Septuagint Version', pp. 180–83) defends four sections on the basis of language and translation technique, though she argues that they do not represent the work of different translators but rather result from the need for variation in a long text. The issue of multiple translators remains an open issue. From his study of the infinitives, Soisalon-Soininen (*Die Infinitive*, p. 175) could not decide whether one, two or three translators were responsible for the book. Neither could Sollamo (*Renderings*, pp. 278–79) on the basis of the translation of the Hebrew semi-prepositions. Hauspie ('La version', pp. 423–25) located some grammatical features in Ezekiel 26–39 that are absent or different from the other two sections. Lust ('Ezekiel 36–40', pp. 517–33) carries the issue of the homogeneity of the book (the omission of Ezek. 36.23b-38 in 967) from a problem inherent to the Greek text back to the Hebrew *Vorlage*.

II. Time and Place of Composition

The Greek version of Ezekiel is likely of Alexandrian origin (Thackeray, *Septuagint*, pp. 9–39; *BGS*, p. 105), although some have argued based on content-related criteria for a Palestinian origin (Lust, 'And I Shall Hang Him', p. 221). Ezekiel belongs to the Latter Prophets, the translation of which was undertaken after the Pentateuch. The translation of Ezekiel dates from the second century B.C.E. (*BGS*, pp. 97, 111). In a relative chronology it is situated after the composition of the Psalms (early second century or first century B.C.E.) and before Isaiah (170–132 B.C.E.). Munnich has demonstrated the posteriority of certain books to the Psalms, on the basis of influence from the Psalms on these books. Such is the case for Ezekiel (*BGS*, p. 96; Munnich, 'Étude lexicographique').

3. Language

In general the translator of Ezekiel pursued transparency in the vocabulary used. When he did not understand the Hebrew word, he did not turn it into Greek by adding Greek endings to a Hebrew word, as shown by the infrequency of loan-words, but he transliterated it, admitting his trouble but leaving the difficulties to the reader (Spottorno,

‘Lexical Aspects’, pp. 78–81; Hauspie, ‘Neologisms’, p. 32). These frequent transliterations are mainly limited to technical architectural vocabulary (Spottorno, ‘Lexical Aspects’, p. 79); a considerable number of these words are used exclusively in chs. 40–48 to describe the new temple (Lust, ‘Lexicon of the Three’, pp. 281–88). The same transliterations also appear in the description of Solomon’s temple in 3 Kingdoms (Thackeray, ‘Greek Translators’, p. 39).

Regardless of these transliterations the translator in general preferred a Greek-looking text. In this respect he was not reluctant to use neologisms (Hauspie, ‘Neologisms’). Most newly created words in Ezekiel agree with the general adaptability of the Greek language to new word-formations, and some may simply be unattested in extant sources. Quite a number of these words are used exclusively in Ezekiel (Spottorno, ‘Lexical Aspects’, pp. 80–84). They are *ad hoc* formations which are coined by the translator for this occasion, to meet a particular need, and unlikely to appear again: for example, *μεγαλόσαρκος* ‘great of flesh’, *μεγαλοπτέρυγος* ‘with great wings’, *ἀποτροπιάζομαι* ‘to avert by sacrifice’ (Lee, *Lexical Study*, p. 52; Hauspie, ‘Neologisms’, p. 27). These word-formations are proper Greek, adapting standard constituent elements. Many neologisms are new compounds of verbs with prepositions (*ἐκσαρκίζω* ‘to strip off flesh’, *ἐξατιμόομαι* ‘to be dishonoured’), which is a normal feature of Koine Greek. Some of the neologisms evoke elevated or poetic style, not the common everyday language, by forming compounds: *χαρακοβολία* ‘forming a palisade’, *ἥπατοσκοπέω* ‘inspect the liver for soothsaying’, *λεωπετρία* ‘bare rock’. The translator uses newly coined compound adjectives to describe personal characteristics, such as *βαθύχειλος* ‘thick-lipped’, *βαρύγλωσσος* ‘heavy-tongued’, *ἀλλόφωνος* ‘of a different language’, *σκληροκάρδιος* ‘hard-hearted’. These words reflect the adjectival compounds to denote physical descriptions of persons in prosopographic lists of the papyri. The translator also used neologisms from the Pentateuch (*διαγλύφω*, *κατοδυνάω*, *ἐπισυνάγω*), but the fact that the underlying Hebrew is different in the Pentateuch and Ezekiel suggests that the translator probably did not use wordlists, but drew on the (spoken) vocabulary in use.

The translator did not use new loan-words but rather those already found in the Pentateuch. By using these words he contributed to their continued use in Greek religious (Christian) literature: *πασχα* ‘Passover’,

χερουβ ‘cherub’, κόρος ‘kor, a dry measure’ (Hauspie, ‘Neologisms’, pp. 28–29). When using loan-words, the translator referred to specific realities of the Hebrew Bible or world that belonged to the everyday knowledge of a Jew, and therefore they would not have caused any problem for the reader familiar with this religious and cultural background (Harl, ‘Problèmes’, p. 38; Hauspie, ‘Neologisms’, p. 29; Tov, ‘Compound Words’, p. 200).

The Greek text largely follows the Hebrew on the level of syntax. Some of these calques are acceptable in Greek, but their frequency is much higher than one finds in composition Greek. Examples include the use of αὐτός as demonstrative pronoun (Hauspie, ‘Idiolect’, pp. 209–11, 213) and the use of prepositional phrases like εἰς πρόσωπον and κατὰ πρόσωπον ‘before’ (Hauspie, ‘Prepositional’, pp. 89–105; Sollamo, *Renderings*, p. 104). Some calques make use of an ambiguity in the Greek language itself: the unidiomatic use of τοῦ + infinitive for complement clause, motivated by the Hebrew הַ + infinitive construct, only follows upon verbs that govern the genitive for the noun complement (e.g., ἀμαρτάνω, φείδομαι; Hauspie, ‘Proposition’, pp. 163–82). The translator uses expressions common in Koine, such as ὑπέρ + accusative, to express a comparative notion with verbs, but the frequency by which they appear in Ezekiel surpasses typical Greek and is responsible in part for the particular character of this translation.

However, there are also many examples in which the translator avoids using a Hebraism, favouring the idiolect of the Greek. For example, אֱלֹהִים is rendered by αὐτός in one third of the nominative cases expressing subject but by οὗτος in two thirds of the cases (Hauspie, ‘Idiolect’, pp. 209–11). Instrumentality of parts of the body is not expressed by ἐν + dative, but always by simple dative, although the MT has -בַּ instrumenti (Hauspie, ‘Ἐν with Dative’, pp. 201–24), and the comparative of adjectives always appears under its expected suffixed form, never as adjective followed by ὑπέρ + accusative for the Hebrew comparative לְ construction (Hauspie, ‘L’expression’, pp. 201–22). Although the grammatical peculiarities draw attention, they mainly account for only a small percentage; the corresponding Hebrew construction is more than often rendered by good non-translational Greek (Hauspie, ‘Idiolect’, p. 213).

IV. Translation and Composition

The translation of Ezekiel shows a good deal of literalism, although not always consistently so. A major issue in its study, nevertheless, is the distinct characteristics of certain sections (cf. § I.c). Before the discovery of 967, Thackeray already noticed in 1903 that Ezek. 36.23c-38 (which he calls ββ) differs from the rest of the book, on the level of style and vocabulary; he described it as another version resembling that of Theodotion (Thackeray, 'Greek Translators', pp. 407–408). It was probably inserted from a lectionary used in the synagogue. Half a century later with the discovery of 967 his hypotheses proved correct. The major features of 967 are its omission of Ezek. 36.23c-38, the alternative order of chs. 36–40 and its single rendering of the divine name (Lust, 'Ezekiel 36–40', pp. 517–33). These are differences due to a different *Vorlage*, not created by the scribe or translator. Ezekiel 36.23c-38 was originally not present in the *Vorlage*; in a later recension it was inserted in the Greek text by another translator/scribe (this explains the different style and terminology), to conform more closely to the Hebrew text which later became the MT. This hand is most likely attributable to the Asiatic school (Lust, 'Ezekiel 36–40', p. 521). An opposing view maintains that the changed order and omission in 967 could just as well be ascribed to accidental damage to the text at some early stage, the accidental loss of a page containing Ezek. 36.23b-38 (due to frequent use as lectionary in the synagogue) or to *parablepsis* through *homoioteleuton* (Filson, 'Omission', pp. 27–32; Spottorno, 'La omisión', pp. 93–98; Van der Meer, 'New Spirit', pp. 147–58). Regardless, 967 is not an isolated text; the *Vetus Latina Codex Wirceburgensis* (sixth century C.E.) supports this omission and transposition.

Lust demonstrates the relationship between this omission and the different sequence of chs. 36–40 (Lust, 'Ezekiel 36–40', pp. 529–31). Chapters 38 and 39, dealing with the battle-scene against Gog of Magog, follow upon Ezek. 36.23. Chapter 36 describes the peaceful restoration of Israel, which continues at the beginning of ch. 38 with Israel dwelling peacefully in its land. Further in ch. 38 the final battle against Gog is mentioned to vindicate God's name that had been profaned by his people. In ch. 39 the end of Gog and his army is described—their bones are strewn all over the battle-field until they are buried in the valley of

Hammon—alongside the gift of God’s spirit, the latter being further developed in ch. 37. Chapter 37, with the well-known vision of the resurrection of the dry bones, is inserted between chs. 39 and 40; it promises the restoration of the temple and prepares for chs. 40–48 with the reunification of the state and the new temple. In this logical composition Ezek. 36.23c–38 would have no function. It is composed of expressions from the surrounding sections and was inserted in the text after the changed sequence of chs. 36–40, functioning as a theological transition from chs. 36 to 37. The Pharisees probably influenced the reorganisation of these chapters, as they sought to avoid a particular apocalyptic reading of the text in which the final battle is followed by the resurrection (Lust, ‘Ezekiel 36–40’, pp. 529–33).

Although the translator rendered his *Vorlage* with relative literalness, the translation is not very consistent: not all occurrences of a given Hebrew root or word are rendered by the same Greek equivalent, as the translator exhibits a tendency towards variation (Ziegler, ‘Zur Textgestaltung’; Spottorno, ‘Lexical Aspects’, pp. 80–81). The Hebrew תועבה, for example, is usually rendered by βδέλυγμα in the Septuagint, but Ezekiel renders it variously as βδέλυγμα, ἀνομία and ἁμαρτία. Besides a variety of translations in Ezekiel for the same Hebrew term, the book shows a tendency to variation in translation equivalences in relation to other books: for instance, קהל is rendered by ὄχλος in Ezekiel, but usually by συναγωγή elsewhere in the LXX (Spottorno, ‘Lexical Aspects’, p. 81).

In adopting a word-for-word translation the translator sometimes had to interfere with the text to render all the notions of the Hebrew text. For example, the phrase πίπτω ἐπὶ πρόσωπόν μου (Ezek. 1.28) occurs in past narrative (preceding verse is aorist) but is rendered with the present indicative, while the corresponding Hebrew has two *w^ayiqtol* verbs. The translator deliberately chose the present tense (πίπτω) to disconnect the verb from its surrounding past verbs so that it would not be read in one breath with them. The same happens to the phrase in the Theodotion version of Daniel, in sharp contrast with the past reading of the parallel Septuagint version. The translator of Ezekiel, moved by awe for divine transcendence, was apparently sensitive to the religious implications of the Greek phraseology (Hauspie, ‘πίπτω’, pp. 513–30).

V. Key Text-Critical Issues

Many of the differences between the Septuagint and the MT are not due to textual factors, but have their roots in the literary growth of the text and therefore can be called recensional differences. However, a few verses deserve attention from a text-critical point of view, as they contribute to the reconstruction of the original form of the Greek translation.

The adverb ὡσπερ in Ezek. 5.1, as found in the edition of Ziegler, is not supported by Greek manuscript evidence. It is an emendation by Katz of ὑπέρ, attested in the manuscripts, in the light of readings in Theodoret of Cyrus, Jerome and the Peshitta. Moreover, the comparative expression ὑπέρ with adjective is absent from LXX Ezekiel; the adjectival comparative is always expressed by the suffixed form (Hauspie, ‘L’expression’, pp. 201–22). As all Greek manuscripts at 5.1 unanimously have ὑπέρ, this reading must have entered the tradition very early.

Some additions and omissions may be noted in the text. Ezekiel 12.26–28 contains a short oracle, repeating most of the terminology of the preceding oracle. The phrase οἶκος Ἰσραηλ ‘house of Israel’ in v. 27 faithfully renders the Hebrew, but the Septuagint adds ὁ παραπικραίνων ‘that embitters’. This addition is probably caused by בית המרי in v. 25. The following λέγοντες λέγουσιν ‘speaking they speak’, which recalls the Hebrew paronomastic idiom (infinitive absolute followed by indicative form of the same verb), corresponds to אמרִים in the MT, without the infinitive absolute. The Greek phrase is unusual in Ezekiel, and therefore it is unlikely that it belonged to the original Septuagint (Lust, ‘Use’, p. 14). Ezekiel 12.26–28 is missing in 967, most probably owing to *parablepsis*: Ezek. 12.25 and 12.28 end with καὶ ποιήσω, λέγει κύριος, and 12.26 and 13.1 begin with καὶ ἐγένετο λόγος κυρίου πρὸς με λέγων Ὑἱὲ ἀνθρώπου. The scribe’s eye jumped from the end of Ezek. 12.25 to 13.1, omitting thus a whole section (Filson, ‘Omission’, pp. 27–32). Such errors of skipping phrases or larger groups of words are very frequent in 967, particularly in cases of *homoioteleuton* (Johnson *et al.*, *The John H. Scheide Biblical Papyri*, p. 7).

In Ezek. 13.7 נאם־יהוה is translated by φήσιν κύριος. This Hebrew phrase is usually rendered by λέγει κύριος in Ezekiel. The phrase and the second part of v. 7 are missing in B and 967. The final part of

Ezek. 13.7 was probably missing in the original Septuagint, and later added; this conclusion is supported by the testimony of Jerome that the pre-Hexaplaric text—reflected in B and 967—offered the shorter version (Lust, ‘Use’, pp. 13–14).

These few examples show that words or verses in some or all manuscripts were changed or added to the original Septuagint by a later hand.

VI. Ideology and Exegesis

Although the Septuagint version of Ezekiel reveals something of the opinions, beliefs, and exegetical orientation of the translator, the resulting picture is not uniform. The translation discussed above of *πίπτω ἐπὶ πρόσωπόν μου*, for example, testifies to the translator’s awe for divine transcendence. Divergences of the Septuagint with regard to the MT—excluding, of course, those caused by scribal errors, text-critical alterations, or editing of the Hebrew *Vorlage*—may be pointers to exegesis, although probably not in most cases.

The plus in the Septuagint of Ezek. 43.3 has a significant exegetical content (Lust, ‘Exegesis’, pp. 208–32). The translator adds the chariot (*τοῦ ἄρματος*) to his report of the first vision of the throne-chariot he saw at the river Chobar; the term, whose Hebrew counterpart is absent in Ezekiel’s visions, recalls a long exegetical tradition of *merkabah* (= chariot) interpretation (Halperin, ‘Merkabah Midrash’, pp. 352–56).

Ezekiel 17.22-24 shows a theologically interesting difference between the Septuagint and the MT. The Septuagint has ‘I shall hang (*κρεμάσω*) him (*αὐτόν*) on a lofty mountain’, evoking a messianic expectation, absent from the MT. The phrase *κρεμάσω αὐτόν* in Ezek. 17.23, evidenced by all Greek manuscripts but 967, may refer to the Messiah hanging on the cross at the mountain of Golgotha. The verb *κρεμάσω* is absent in 967 which has *κρεμαστόν*, more in line with the *hapax* *תלול* ‘lofty’ in the MT, and probably reflecting the Old Greek. Therefore, *κρεμάσω* in Ezek. 17.22 thus betrays a later, Christological reading of these verses (Lust, ‘And I Shall Hang Him’, pp. 231–50).

With respect to messianism, it has repeatedly been said that the Septuagint displays signs of a developing messianism (Coppens, *Le messianisme*, p. 119) in certain verses (Ezek. 12.26-28; 16.4; 17.23;

21.30-32; 34.23-24; 37.22-25; 43.3). Lust has convincingly demonstrated in several articles that the original Septuagint does not add to individual messianic connotations of the Hebrew text, and that each so-called messianic passage should be evaluated on its own (Lust, *Messianism*). Some examples may illustrate this. In Ezek. 21.30-32 the Septuagint version condemns the high priests who prefer royal powers over priestly ones and announces the coming of a new high priest who will be worthy of the priestly turban. This refers merely to a priestly messianic expectation as opposed to a royal Davidic messianic one as expressed by the MT (Lust, 'Messianism', pp. 174–91). Additionally, the Old Greek of Ezek. 17.22, an oracle of salvation that mentions 'their hearts I will pluck off', is less open to an individual messianic interpretation, whereas the MT clearly mentions 'one tender shoot' favouring the expectation of the coming of a new king (Lust, 'And I Shall Hang Him', pp. 231–50).

VI. Reception History

Ezekiel is rarely cited in the New Testament. Mark 4.32 can be understood as the only more or less explicit quotation of Ezek. 17.23 and 31.6 (Lust, 'And I Shall Hang Him', p. 245). Revelation displays a clear dependency on Ezekiel, as evidenced by numerous allusions and a handful of quotations (Kowalski, *Rezeption*). The author of Revelation 20–22 was obviously inspired by the vision of Ezekiel about the dry bones (Ezek. 37.1-14), the unification of Israel (Ezek. 37.15-28), the battle against Gog of Magog (Ezek. 38–39) and the building of the new temple (Ezek. 40–48). Likewise the oracle against Tyre in Ezekiel 26–27, influenced the description of the destruction of Babylon (Rev. 18). It should be noted that the order of the respective chapters preserved in the pre-Hexaplaric 967 (Ezek. 38; 39; 37; 40–48) corresponds to the order of the events recorded in Revelation 19–22 (Lust, 'Order', pp. 179–83).

Preserved Ezekiel commentaries of the early church fathers are scarce. Theodoret's commentary on Ezekiel is the only complete Greek commentary on this prophet that has come to us. Besides theological explanation (Hauspie, 'Theodoret', pp. 503–11; 'Ezek 1', pp. 79–87) this commentary contains much philological information. Jerome provides us with a commentary on Ezekiel giving the translation of both the Hebrew text and the Septuagint.

Bibliography

- Bogaert, P.-M., 'Les deux rédactions conservées (LXX et TM) d'Ézéchiel 7', in J. Lust (ed.), *Ezekiel and His Book: Textual and Literary Criticism and Their Interrelation* (BETL 74; Leuven: Peeters, 1986), pp. 21–47.
- Coppens, J., *Le messianisme royal: ses origines, son développement, son accomplissement* (LD 54; Paris: Cerf, 1968).
- Fernández-Galiano, M., 'Nuevas páginas del código 967 del A.T. griego (Ez 28,19–43,9) (PMatr. bibl. 1)', *SPap* 10 (1971), pp. 5–76.
- Filson, F.V., 'The Omission of Ezek. 12,26-28 and 36,23b-38 in Codex 967', *JBL* 62 (1943), pp. 27–32.
- Halperin, D.J., 'Merkabah Midrash in the Septuagint', *JBL* 101 (1982), pp. 351–63.
- Harl, M., 'Problèmes de traduction du Pentateuque de la Septante dans une langue moderne', *Annali di Scienze Religiose* 1 (1996), pp. 33–53.
- Hauspie, K., 'Ev with Dative Indicating Instrument in the Septuagint of Ezekiel', in M. Peters (ed.), *XII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Leiden 2004* (SBLSCS 54; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), pp. 201–24.
- 'πίπτω ἐπὶ πρόσωπόν μου: A Set Phrase in Ezekiel?', in B. Taylor (ed.), *Xth Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Oslo 1998* (SBLSCS 51; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2001), pp. 513–30.
- 'L'expression du comparatif et du superlatif dans la Septante d'Ézéchiel', in H. Ausloos, B. Lemmelijn and M. Vervenne (eds.), *Florilegium Lovaniense* (Festschrift F. García Martínez; BETL 224; Leuven: Peeters, 2008), pp. 201–22.
- 'Ezek 1: Approach by Theodoretus of Cyrrhus. Notes on Ezekiel's Vision of the Throne-Chariot', in H. Ausloos, J. Cook, F. García Martínez, B. Lemmelijn and M. Vervenne (eds.), *Textual Studies in Early Judaism: The Septuagint and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (BETL 213; Leuven: Peeters, 2008), pp. 79–87.
- 'The Idiolect of the Target Language in the Translation Process: A Study of the Calques in the Septuagint of Ezekiel', in W. Kraus and M. Karrer (eds.), *Die Septuaginta—Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten* (WUNT 219; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), pp. 205–13.
- 'Neologisms in the Septuagint of Ezekiel', *JNSL* 27 (2001), pp. 17–37.
- 'Proposition complétive avec τοῦ et l'infinifit dans la Septante d'Ézéchiel', in R. Pierri (ed.), *Grammatica intellectio Scripturae. Saggi filologici di greco biblico* (Festschrift L. Cignelli; Studium Biblicum Franciscanum Analecta 68; Jerusalem: Franciscan Printing Press, 2006), pp. 163–82.
- 'Prepositional Phrases in the Septuagint of Ezekiel', in A. Voitila and J. Jokiranta (eds.), *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls* (Festschrift R. Sollamo; JSJSup 126; Leiden: Brill, 2008), pp. 89–105.

- ‘Theodoret and Messianic Verses in the Septuagint Version of Ezekiel’, in M. Knibb (ed.), *The Septuagint and Messianism* (BETL 195; Leuven: Peeters, 2006), pp. 503–11.
- ‘La version de la Septante d’Ézéchiel: traduction annotée d’Ez 1–24 et étude dugrec d’Ézéchiel par une sélection de particularités lexicales et grammaticales’ (Ph.D. dissertation, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, 2002).
- Herrmann, J., ‘Die Gottesnamen im Ezechieltexte. Eine Studie zur Ezechielkritik und zur Septuagintawertung’, in A. Alt et al. (eds.), *Alttestamentliche Studien. Rudolf Kittel zum 60. Geburtstag* (BWAT 13; Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs’sche Buchhandlung, 1913), pp. 70–87.
- Jahn, P.L.G., *Der griechische Text des Buches Ezechiel nach dem Kölner Teil des Papyrus 967* (PTA 15; Bonn: Rudolf Habelt, 1972).
- Johnson, A.C., H.S. Gehman and E.H. Kase, *The John H. Scheide Biblical Papyri: Ezekiel* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1938).
- Kenyon, F.G., *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri: Descriptions and Texts of Twelve Manuscripts on Papyrus of the Greek Bible. Fasciculus VII: Ezekiel, Daniel, Esther* (2 vols.; London: Emery Walker, 1937–38).
- Kowalski, B., *Die Rezeption des Propheten Ezechiel in der Offenbarung des Johannes* (SBB 52; Stuttgart: Katholische Bibelwerk, 2004).
- Lee, J.A.L., *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch* (SBLSCS 14; Chico: Scholars Press, 1983).
- Lilly, I.E., *Two Books of Ezekiel: Papyrus 967 and the Masoretic Text as Variant Literary Editions* (VTSup 150; Leiden: Brill, 2012).
- Lust, J., ‘אֲדָנִי יְהוָה in Ezekiel and Its Counterpart in the Old Greek’, *ETL* 72 (1996), pp. 138–45.
- ‘And I Shall Hang Him on a Lofty Mountain: Ezek 17:22-24 and Messianism in the Septuagint’, in B. Taylor (ed.), *IXth Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Cambridge 1995* (SBLSCS 45; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), pp. 231–50.
- ‘Exegesis and Theology in the Septuagint of Ezekiel: The Longer “Plusses” and Ezek 43:1–9’, in C. Cox (ed.), *VI Congress of International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Jerusalem 1986* (SBLSCS 23; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), pp. 201–32.
- ‘Ezekiel 36–40 in the Oldest Greek Manuscript’, *CBQ* 43 (1981), pp. 517–33.
- ‘A Lexicon of the Three and the Transliterations in Ezekiel’, in A. Salvesen (ed.), *Origen’s Hexapla: Papers Presented at the Rich Seminar on the Hexapla, Oxford Centre for Hebrew and Jewish Studies, 25th July–3rd August 1994* (TSAJ 58; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), pp. 274–301.
- ‘Major Divergences between LXX and MT in Ezekiel’, in A. Schenker (ed.), *The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible: The Relationship between the Masoretic Text and the Hebrew Base of the Septuagint Reconsidered* (SBLSCS 52; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003), pp. 83–92.

- Messianism and the Septuagint: Collected Essays* (ed. K. Hauspie; BETL 178; Leuven: Peeters, 2004).
- ‘Messianism and Septuagint’, in J.A. Emerton (ed.), *Congress Volume, Salamanca 1983* (VTSup 36; Leiden: Brill, 1985), pp. 174–91.
- ‘The Order of the Final Events in Revelation and in Ezekiel’, in J. Lambrecht (ed.), *L’Apocalypse johannique et l’Apocalyptique dans le Nouveau Testament* (BETL 53; Leuven: Peeters, 1980), pp. 179–83.
- ‘The Use of Textual Witnesses for the Establishment of the Text. The Shorter and Longer Texts of Ezekiel. An Example: Ez 7’, in J. Lust (ed.), *Ezekiel and His Book: Textual and Literary Criticism and Their Interrelation* (BETL 74; Leuven: Peeters, 1986), pp. 7–20.
- Lust, J., K. Hauspie and A. Ternier, ‘Notes to the Septuagint: Ezekiel 7’, *ETL* 77 (2001), pp. 384–94.
- Marquis, G., ‘Word Order as a Criterion for the Evaluation of Translation Technique in the LXX and the Evaluation of Word-Order Variants as Exemplified in LXX-Ezekiel’, *Textus* 13 (1986), pp. 59–84.
- McGregor, L.J., *The Greek Text of Ezekiel: An Examination of its Homogeneity* (SBLSCS 18; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985).
- Meer, M. van der, ‘A New Spirit in an Old Corpus? Text-Critical, Literary-Critical and Linguistic Observations Regarding Ezekiel 36:16-38’, in F. Postma, K. Spronk and E. Talstra (eds.), *The New Things: Eschatology in Old Testament Prophecy* (Festschrift H. Leene; Amsterdamse Cahiers voor Exegese van de Bijbel en zijn Tradities, Supplement Series 3; Maastricht: Shaker, 2002), pp. 147–58.
- Munnich, O., ‘Étude lexicographique du Psautier des LXX’ (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Paris, 1982).
- Muraoka, T., ‘A Re-examination of the Two-Translator Theory of a Septuagint Book’, *BIOSCS* 5 (1972), p. 9.
- Patmore, H.M., ‘The Shorter and the Longer Texts of Ezekiel: The Implications of the Manuscript Finds from Masada and Qumran’, *JSOT* 32 (2007), pp. 231–42.
- Schäfers, J., ‘Ist das Buch Ezechiel in der Septuaginta von einem oder mehreren Dolmetschern übersetzt?’, *TGl* 1 (1909), pp. 289–91.
- Soisalon-Soininen, I., *Die Infinitive in der Septuaginta* (Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae B-132/1; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1965).
- Sollamo, R., *Renderings of Hebrew Semiprepositions in the Septuagint* (Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae 19; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1979).
- Spottorno, M.V., ‘La omisión de Ez. 36, 23b-38 y la transposición de capítulos en el papiro 967’, *Emerita* 50 (1982), pp. 93–98.
- ‘Some Lexical Aspects in the Greek Text of Ezekiel’, in J. Lust (ed.), *Ezekiel and His Book: Textual and Literary Criticism and Their Interrelation* (BETL 74; Leuven: Peeters, 1986), pp. 78–84.

- Thackeray, H.St.J., 'The Greek Translators of Ezekiel', *JTS* 4 (1903), pp. 398–411.
- The Septuagint and Jewish Worship* (The Schweich Lectures 1920; London: British Academy, 1923).
- Tov, E., 'Compound Words in the LXX Representing Two or More Hebrew Words', *Bib* 58 (1977), pp. 189–212.
- 'Recensional Differences between the MT and LXX of Ezekiel', *ETL* 62 (1986), pp. 89–101.
- The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch. A Discussion of an Early Revision of the LXX of Jeremiah 29–52 and Baruch 1:1–3:8* (HSM 8; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976).
- The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research. Revised and Enlarged Edition* (Jerusalem Biblical Studies 8; Jerusalem: Simor, 1997).
- Turner, N., 'The Greek Translators of Ezekiel', *JTS* 7 (1956), pp. 12–24.
- Turner, P.D.M., 'The Septuagint Version of Chapters I–XXXIX of the Book of Ezekiel' (Ph.D. dissertation, Oxford University, 1970).
- Ziegler, J., 'Die Bedeutung des Chester Beatty-Scheide Papyrus 967 für die Textüberlieferung der Ezechiel-Septuaginta', *ZAW* 60 (1949), pp. 76–94.
- 'Zur Textgestaltung der Ezechiel-Septuaginta', *Bib* 34 (1953), pp. 435–55.
- Ziegler, J., and D. Fraenkel (eds.), *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum*. Vol. XVI.1, *Ezechiel* (2nd ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977 [1952]).

Daniel

(Old Greek and Theodotion)

R. Timothy McLay

Editions

(a) Standard Greek Editions

Göttingen, vol. XVI.2, *Susanna, Daniel, Bel et Draco* (Ziegler and Munnich, 1999; 2nd ed.).

Rahlfs-Hanhart, vol. II, pp. 870–935.

Swete, vol. III, pp. 498–575.

(b) Other Greek Editions

Der Septuaginta-Text (Geissen, 1968).

Der Septuaginta-Text Kap I–II; Der Septuaginta-Text Kap III–IV (Hamm, 1969).

‘Daniel: Dos Semifolgi del Codex 967’ (Roca-Puig, 1976).

Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri. Fasc. VIII (Kenyon, 1937–1938).

(c) Modern Translations

NETS (McLay, 2007), pp. 991–1022.

LXX.D (Engel and Neef, 2009), pp. 1423–1461.

(d) Additional Comments

Papyrus 967 is the only pre-Hexaplaric witness to the OG version.

I. General Characteristics

Like Esther and Judges, there are two ancient Greek versions of the book of Daniel: the OG, which is a dynamic translation, and ‘Theodotion’ (Th),¹ which is more formally equivalent. Both Greek editions have

1. The term ‘Theodotion’ is only a matter of convention. Theodotion is purported to have lived in the second century, but there are citations in the New Testament that are attributed to this version.

twelve chapters that (more or less) correspond to the MT, and both retain the note in Dan. 2.4 of MT which indicates the change in language from Hebrew to Aramaic (running until the end of ch. 7). Furthermore, they have several additions in common: Bel and the Snake (more popularly known as Bel and the Dragon), Susanna, and the Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the Three Young Men. Thus, around the turn of the common era there were three distinct versions of Daniel. The OG and Th versions were distinguished from the Semitic version by the inclusion of the Additions, and from one another by alternative content in chs. 4–6. Despite the obvious relationship between the two Greek editions and their dependence upon a Semitic *Vorlage* that in most chapters was very similar to what has been preserved in MT, there are distinct differences between the three ancient editions, and many unresolved questions remain.

There are only three main witnesses to the OG version. The Chisian codex 88 and the Syro-Hexaplar (Syh) version are post-Hexaplaric and reflect very similar texts, while the more fragmentary Papyrus 967 is the only pre-Hexaplaric witness to the OG version of Daniel. Papyrus 967 has an anomaly compared to the other witnesses: chs. 7 and 8 are positioned out of order between chs. 4 and 5. The change in order provides a smoother chronology because the narrative of chs. 1–4 take place in the time of Nebuchadnezzar, chs. 7–8 and 5 in the reign of Belshazzar, 6 and 9 in the period of Darius, and 10–12 are dated in the first year of Cyrus. One other difference between the OG and Th versions is the order of the additions. In the OG Susanna appears first and acts like an introduction to the ‘wise’ Daniel, while in Th Susanna follows ch. 12.

Chapters 4 to 6 contain what appear to be many additions and expansions in the OG. Montgomery and Bludau had argued that the additions were midrashic in origin (Montgomery, *Commentary*, pp. 36–37; Bludau, *Die alexandrinische Übersetzung*, p. 143), while others like Jahn and Charles argued for the originality of its text (Jahn, *Das Buch*; Charles, *Commentary*, p. lvii). Although it may now be stated with some confidence that it has become a scholarly consensus that the OG in these chapters witnesses to an earlier *Vorlage* than MT/Th, McLay has demonstrated that the expansions and additions in the OG text are the result of later interpolations from Th. Wills and Albertz have subjected the alternative redactions of Daniel for these chapters to form-critical

analysis and argued that the OG version is evidence of a more original Semitic text for the book (see Wills, *The Jew*; Albertz, *Der Gott*; cf. Munnich, ‘Texte Massorétique’).

II. Time and Place of Composition

It is evident that the Semitic text went through a series of redactions before its final form was completed around 164 B.C.E. (Collins, *Daniel*, pp. 35–37). Based on the shared vocabulary between the OG and 1 Maccabees (1 Macc. 1.9 = Dan. 12.4; 1 Macc. 1.18 = Dan. 11.36; 1 Macc. 1.54 = Dan. 11.31; 1 Macc. 4.41, 43 = Dan. 8.14) and a parallel between Dan. 1.3 and 1 Esd. 2.9, the translation of the OG version is generally dated around the beginning of the first century B.C.E. in Alexandria (Montgomery, *Commentary*, p. 38; Hartman and Di Lella, *Book of Daniel*, p. 78). However, this dating must also be refined because the OG most likely reflects multiple translators. It is a scholarly consensus that the original versions of the court-tales in chs. 2–6 were composed in the third to second centuries B.C.E. and were later redacted into their present Semitic form. Wills examines the OG for these chapters and convincingly demonstrates that the shared redactional characteristics in these chapters show these tales circulated as an independent collection (Wills, *The Jew*, pp. 144–52). In addition, Albertz offers evidence from the translation of vocabulary in chs. 4–6 in the OG that these chapters reflect a different translator from the rest of the book. For example, $\eta\eta\aleph$ is translated by aorist forms of $\phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omega$ in 5.2, 3, 23; 6.17(18); but forms of $\epsilon\rho\chi\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ in 3.2; 7.13, 22 and $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omega$ in 3.13(2 \times). Likewise, $\eta\psi$ is rendered by $\epsilon\tau\eta$ in 4.13, 29, but $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ in 2.8, 9, 21; 7.12, 25(3 \times), $\delta\tau\alpha\nu$ in 3.5, and $\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha$ in 3.15 (Albertz, *Der Gott*, pp. 91–92). McLay illustrates the inner coherence of vocabulary within chs. 4–6(7) by noting terms that only appear in these chapters of OG. In some cases, these terms are not found in Th either. For example: $\alpha\iota\nu\acute{\epsilon}\omega$ appears in ch. 2 (1 \times), ch. 4 (4 \times), and ch. 5 (2 \times), but nowhere else. $\acute{\alpha}\chi\rho\epsilon\iota\acute{o}\omega$ is found only in OG in ch. 4.11(14) and 6.20(21). $\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\omega$ occurs only in the OG in ch. 6 (3 \times) and ch. 7 (1 \times), and $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ only in the OG in ch. 4 (3 \times) and ch. 6 (4 \times) (McLay, ‘Formation’, pp. 306–7; many other examples could be added).

Besides the differences in the use of vocabulary in OG chs. 4–6(7) compared to the remainder of the book, one also has to explain how the content of these chapters differs so markedly from Th and MT. McLay argues that the best way to account for the separate literary editions of Daniel is that the Maccabean crisis resulted in a separate literary edition and development of the book for chs. 2–6(7) in Alexandria. A scribe may have taken the early collection of court-tales to Alexandria before the introduction, chs. 8–12, and other editing of the Semitic text were completed.

Based on the fact that the Th version retains the additions yet reflects a text that is similar to MT means that it most likely would have been completed fairly soon after the completion of the Semitic version somewhere in Palestine in the first century B.C.E.

III. Language

Generally speaking, OG exhibits more diversity in its choice of lexical equivalents, but Th's tendency to employ stereotyped equivalents is abandoned when the choice is not appropriate in the context. Excluding the end of ch. 3 through the conclusion of ch. 6, for which OG is based on a different source text, OG tends to provide equivalents for each of the lexical and morphological elements in the source text as well. The overall tendency of both versions to follow the source text results in Greek that is unnatural but not unreadable.

The Semitic character of the Greek texts is displayed most particularly in the predominate use of a paratactic style. OG introduces alternatives to the Semitic syntax more frequently than Th, but the foreign style is still obvious. In the same way that the syntactic style of both versions is affected because they follow the source text rather closely, it also affects the frequency of articular infinitives, the number and placement of genitive adjectives, and the use of adjectives in general.

Linguistic differences between OG and Th arise from the differences in translation style and especially in Th from close adherence to the source text. OG shows a greater independence in its choice of lexemes and particularly in its creative use of neologisms (see further § IV).

IV. Translation and Composition

Although OG and Th may be respectively characterised as ‘free’ and ‘literal’ translations, the notion of freedom is relative. The main way that OG demonstrates freedom is by avoiding the parataxis of the source text through use of postpositive conjunctions, adverbs, subordinate participles, and the genitive absolute. Both versions omit redundant prepositions, while OG exhibits a greater tendency to introduce slight alterations in word order or additions in order to clarify the meaning for the reader. Some scholars have included Th within the putative *kaige* recension, but this is unlikely (Schmitt, *Stammt*; McLay, ‘*Kaige*’). There are two instances of כּוּן in Daniel (11.8, 22), but *καίγε* only appears in the latter. There is little evidence of other so-called *kaige* characteristics in the book and instead there is greater divergence from the traditional proposed characteristics of *kaige*.

There are ten possible neologisms that are *hapax legomena* in OG Daniel, though they are not all *hapax legomena* in the LXX. Some of the readings are shared with Th Daniel. Alphabetically, the neologisms are *ἀναστατώ* ‘to agitate, subvert’ (Dan. 7.23); *ἀπομαίνομαι* ‘to go crazy’ (Dan. 12.4); *διασυρίζω* ‘to whistle’ (Dan. 3.50); *ἰλατεύω* ‘to be gracious’ (Dan. 9.19); *καταλαιώνω* ‘to grind down’ (Dan. 7.23); *προσταγή* ‘command’ (Dan. 3.95); *συγκερατίζομαι* ‘to fight with horns’ (Dan. 11.40); *συμμολύνομαι* ‘to defile oneself’ (Dan. 1.8); *συναλοάω* ‘to grind into powder’ (Dan. 2.45); and *ὑπερφέρής* ‘surpassing’ (Dan. 2.31). The title *ἀρχιεunuοῦχος* ‘chief eunuch’ is possibly another neologism, but it appears seven times each in OG and Th Daniel. Although most scholars still assume that Th is a revision of OG, the unique character of the version is demonstrated by the fact that it witnesses to nearly as many neologisms as OG. Unlike OG, however, all of the possible neologisms in Th have occurrences in some other book or books. *γρηγόρησις* ‘alertness’ appears in Dan. 5.11, 14 (twice elsewhere in the LXX); *διασκορπισμός* ‘scattering, dispersion’ in Dan. 12.7 (three times elsewhere); *δυναμόω* ‘to strengthen’ in Dan. 9.27 (three times elsewhere); *ἐγκαινισμός* ‘dedication’ in Dan. 3.3 (twelve times elsewhere); *ἔντρομος* ‘trembling’ in Dan. 10.11 (four times elsewhere); *ὄναγρος* ‘wild donkey’ in Dan. 5.21 (twice elsewhere); and *ὑπερηφανεύω* ‘to behave haughtily’ in Dan. 5.20 (six times elsewhere).

One interesting example of a supposed *hapax legomenon* and neologism is the verb *διαμελισθήσεται* ‘he will be dissected’, which occurs in Dan. 3.96(29). Montgomery explained the origin of the word on the basis of an analogy to *μέλη ποιήσαντας* ‘making parts’ in 2 Macc. 1.16 (Montgomery, *Commentary*, p. 148) and the verb is retained by Munnich in the revised edition of Ziegler (Göttingen, p. 288). This is an interesting case of how a scholar’s idea is retained regardless of the evidence. Not only is it far more likely that the Greek letter λ was mistakenly written for the ρ—a frequent orthographic change in manuscripts arising from phonetic assimilation, which occurs on other occasions in the Greek witnesses to Daniel—but the common verb *διαμερισθήσεται* ‘he will be divided’ would make perfect sense in the context. More importantly, that is what Papyrus 967 reads! Munnich inexplicably maintains that it is more likely that a scribe would have erred by writing the more common word (Göttingen, p. 69). So, should we ignore the best witness with the most obvious choice in favour of a scholarly conjecture based on later witnesses that reflect a common orthographic error? This is a case in which an orthographic error created a neologism that was later adopted.

V. Text-Critical Issues

Beside the additional stories in the versions (see Additions to Daniel), there are significant differences in chs. 4–6 compared to Th and MT. In general, the basic story in Daniel 4–6 is the same in the versions transmitted respectively by the OG and MT/Th, but there are numerous differences in details. Chapter 4 narrates the story of the madness of Nebuchadnezzar, but his confession and the publication of his decree appears in an expanded form at the end of the chapter in vv. 34(37)-34c rather than the beginning, and there are other pluses to vv. 14(17), 19(22), 23-25(26-28), 28(31), 30(33). There are also significant minuses that involve vv. 20-22(23-25) when one compares the OG to MT/Th and there is no equivalent for 4.3-6(6-9). Chapter 5 narrates the mysterious writing on the wall, but the OG version includes an abbreviated version of the story as a preface and omits significant portions of vv. 3, 10-13 and has no equivalent for vv. 14-15, 18-22 and 24-25. Chapter 6 has a similar length in the two versions, but there are large pluses in OG in

vv. 3(4), 5(6), 12a, 14(15), 17-18(18-19), 22(23) and minuses in 15(16), 23(24). Even where there are no pluses or minuses in these chapters the Greek versions share little relationship with regard to style, grammar, and, more importantly, vocabulary.

One interesting anomaly in Papyrus 967 is that chs. 7 and 8 appear out of order between chs. 4 and 5. Typically, it is suggested that Papyrus 967 has rearranged the order of the chapters in order to fix the chronology (Collins, *Daniel*, p. 6), but Lust and Munnich have argued for the priority of Papyrus 967 (Lust, 'Septuagint Version'; Munnich, 'Texte Massorétique'). McLay has examined their arguments in detail and demonstrated they are not supported by the evidence ('Formation', pp. 311–18). In addition to problems with specific linguistic details of their arguments, there are fundamental problems with their assumptions. Since any reordering of the chapters and other editorial revisions of the chapters in question must have occurred around the same time, how would the Greek translator have had access to the earlier arrangement and non-edited Semitic version? Furthermore, if this original edition had been compiled, as is supposed by Lust and Munnich, why would chs. 7 and 8 have been moved to a different place? There are other difficulties, such as explaining the fact that ch. 8 is written in Hebrew, not Aramaic like chs. 4–7.

VI. Ideology and Exegesis

As discussed above, Th is primarily a literal or formally equivalent translation of MT. OG, while more free or dynamic in its approach, is generally close to MT as well. A couple of minor examples of exegesis in OG Daniel are the choice of 'the king of Egypt' rendering 'the king of the south' consistently in ch. 11 and the identification of the 'kittim' as the Romans in 11.30; but OG does have a few passages more worthy of note. One of the more difficult cases is in 9.26 where the Hebrew for 'after the seventy-two weeks' is rendered in OG by 'after seven and seventy and sixty-two weeks' to give a total of 139 weeks. Bruce finds this number historically meaningful (Bruce, 'Earliest') and David has attempted to coordinate the chronology with a specific 'anointed one' in the passage (see the analysis of 9.24-27 in David, *Composition*, pp. 279–356). However, the whole of 9.24-27 is full of additions and double

translations and there is not enough evidence reliably to reconstruct the original text of OG for this passage. At the same time, the corruption of the passage in our extant witnesses is testimony to the way the passage was subjected to on-going interpretation. Another example of an interesting text is 7.13 where the text of OG could read ‘the son of man came upon the clouds and as the Ancient of Days’; thus making an identification between the son of man and the Ancient of Days (Bruce, ‘Oldest’). The reader will be forgiven for any confusion since that text does not appear in the critical editions of Daniel despite the fact that ‘as the Ancient of Days’ is the reading of the OG. The reading in the Greek texts may very well represent a mechanical error in translation or later textual corruption (Jeansonne, *Old Greek*, pp. 96–99; McLay, ‘Translation Technique’, pp. 56–57), but it is the reading of the witnesses.

Albertz also argued that ideological exegesis was the reason that the later translator of chs. 1–3, 7–12 adopted the earlier ‘popular’ translation of 4–6. According to Albertz, 4.34c(37) has a definite emphasis on monotheism, which is supported by several references to God being ‘the living God’ who reigns ‘in heaven’ (see 4.23[26], 28[31], 34[37]; 5.23); and these verses coincide with the emphasis on monotheism that is also present in 3.17 (Albertz, *Der Gott*, p. 164). A significant shortcoming with this argument is that the OG does not exhibit a concern for monotheism elsewhere in the book. However, it is an argument that chs. 4–6 originate from a different hand.

VII. Reception History

As previously noted, only three major manuscripts of the OG version of Daniel are now known to exist, and these witnesses exhibit significant interference from the Th translation. Presumably, the so-called Th version was preferred during the course of transmission, because it was closer to what later became MT. Thus, readings from Th Daniel are prominent in Baruch (e.g., Bar. 1.15 and Dan. 9.7; Bar. 1.16 and Dan. 9.8; Bar. 1.18 and Dan. 9.10) and some readings based on Th Daniel are scattered through the Church Fathers (Grelot, ‘Les versions’, pp. 384–86).

Despite the later dominance of Th Daniel, there is evidence of the use of both translations in the New Testament. Montgomery and Charles noted a dozen instances of agreement between Th Daniel and Revelation (e.g., Rev. 9.20 and Dan. 5.23; Rev. 10.5-6 and Dan. 12.7; Rev. 11.7 and Dan. 7.21; Rev. 1.19 and Dan. 2.29, 45), which is the chief reason why the notion of a *proto*-Theodotion (which later became the *kaige* recension) was introduced (Montgomery, *Commentary*, p. 49; Charles, *Commentary*, p. liv). Grelot later added three more agreements (Rev. 1.18 and Dan. 4.31; Rev. 12.8 and Dan. 2.35; Rev. 13.8 and Dan. 12.1) in his important article on the use of the Greek versions of Daniel (Grelot, 'Les versions'). Grelot offers a good examination of citations and possible allusions in the New Testament and the Church Fathers, though as might be expected, some of the allusions are less convincing.

Given its apocalyptic themes, it is not unexpected that the Revelation of John has the most numerous texts that can be clearly distinguished as dependent upon the OG of Daniel. There is the reference to 'one like a son of man' in 1.13, and the description of the appearance of the son of man depends on allusions to the Ancient of Days in Daniel 7: 'his head and hair were white like wool, white as snow' in Rev. 1.14 is dependent upon Dan. 7.9 'his clothing was as white as snow, the hair of his head was white like wool'.² Other agreements with OG Daniel compared to Th Daniel are Rev. 10.5-6 and Dan. 12.7; Rev. 20.15 and OG Dan. 12.1; and Rev. 20.20.12 and Dan. 7.10. Another allusion to Dan. 7.13 occurs in Rev. 1.7 'Behold he is coming with the clouds'. The two allusions to the son of man highlight one of the most important texts of Daniel for the New Testament.

Daniel 7.13 is cited or alluded to, though with various differences in the number and order of words and the prepositions employed, in Mt. 24.30; 26.64; Mk 13.26; 14.62; Lk. 21.27 and Rev. 1.7; 14.14-16. The reference to the son of man forms a crucial part of the background to the witness of the gospels, in which Jesus alone employs the 'son of man' as a self-designation. Vermes argued that 'son of man' was a

2. Numerous allusions in the book of Revelation are based upon Daniel, but their allusive nature make it more difficult to establish specific uses of the Greek versions as opposed to MT. On the question of the use of Daniel in Revelation see Beale, *John's Use*.

Semitic idiom meaning ‘man’ in a generic sense or a circumlocution for ‘I’ (Vermes, *Jesus the Jew*, pp. 160–90; Lindars, *Jesus Son of Man*, pp. 22–24), but Vermes’s interpretation fails to explain the ‘son of man’ sayings in the gospels and their use by Jesus in particular. Most scholars agree that there was no pre-existing tradition that identified a/the ‘son of man’ with a messianic figure,³ so the witness of the gospels is unique. The New Testament witnesses are divided in their reliance upon the Th version where the son of man comes ‘with’ the clouds as opposed to ‘on’ the clouds in the OG. However, regardless of how the variant came to be, the fact that all three OG witnesses to Dan. 7.13 as well as Mt. 24.30; 26.64; Rev. 14.14–16 have the son of man coming ‘on’ the clouds, and the OG also reads that the son of man arrives ‘as the Ancient of Days’ certainly facilitated the connection of the ‘son of man’ with the Ancient of Days and, thus, with a divine figure in the New Testament period.

Bibliography

- Albertz, R., *Der Gott des Daniel: Untersuchungen zu Daniel 4–6 in der Septuagintafassung sowie zu Komposition und Theologie des aramäischen Danielbuches* (SBS 131; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1988).
- Beale, G., *John’s Use of the Old Testament in Revelation* (JSNTSup 166; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1998).
- Bludau, A., *Die alexandrinische Übersetzung des Buches Daniels und ihr Verhältnis zum massoretischen Texten* (Freiburg: Herder, 1897).
- Bruce, F.F., ‘The Earliest Old Testament Interpretation’, *OTS* 17 (1972), pp. 11–36.
—‘The Oldest Greek Version of Daniel’, *OTS* 20 (1977), pp. 22–40.
- Charles, R.H., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1929).
- Collins, J.J., *Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993).
- Geissen, A. *Der Septuaginta-Text des Buches Daniel Kap. 5–12, zusammen mit Susanna, Bel et Draco, sowie Esther Kap. 1,1a–2,15 nach dem kölnen Teil des Papyrus 967* (PTA 5; Bonn: Habelt, 1968).
- Grelot, P., ‘Les versions grecques de Daniel’, *Bib* 47 (1966), pp. 381–402.

3. The ‘Similitudes of Enoch’ (*1 En.* 37–71), particularly *1 En.* 48, make the identification, but this seems to be a later addition.

The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint

- Hamm, W., *Der Septuaginta-Text des Buches Daniel nach dem kölner Teil des Papyrus 967: Kap I–II* (PTA 10; Bonn: Habelt, 1969).
- Der Septuaginta-Text des Buches Daniel nach dem kölner Teil des Papyrus 967: Kap III–IV* (PTA 21; Bonn: Habelt, 1977).
- Hartman, L.F., and A.A. Di Lella, *The Book of Daniel* (AB 23; Garden City: Doubleday, 1977).
- Jahn, G., *Das Buch Daniel nach der Septuaginta hergestellt* (Leipzig: Pfeiffer, 1904).
- Jeansonne, S.P., *The Old Greek Translation of Daniel 7–12* (CBQMS 19; Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1988).
- Kenyon, F.G., *The Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri. Fasc. VIII Ezekiel, Daniel, Esther (Plates and Text)* (2 vols.; London: Emery Walker, 1937–38).
- Lindars, B., *Jesus Son of Man* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983).
- Lust, J., ‘The Septuagint Version of Daniel 4–5’, in A.S. van der Woude (ed.), *The Book of Daniel* (BETL 106; Leuven: Peeters, 1993).
- McLay, T., ‘Kaige and Septuagint Research’, *Textus* 19 (1998), pp. 1–11.
- ‘The Old Greek Translation of Daniel Chapters 4–6 and the Formation of the Book of Daniel’, *VT* 55 (2005), pp. 304–23.
- ‘Translation Technique and Textual Studies in the Old Greek and Theodotion Versions of Daniel’ (Ph.D. dissertation, Durham University, 1994).
- Montgomery, J., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1927).
- Munnich, O. *Susanna–Daniel–Bel et Draco. Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum graecum auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum*, 16.2 (rev. ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999).
- ‘Texte Massorétique et Septante dans le Livre de Daniel’, in A. Schenker (ed.), *The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible: The Relationship between the Masoretic Text and the Hebrew Base of the Septuagint Reconsidered* (SBLSCS 52; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003), pp. 93–120.
- Roca-Puig, R., ‘Daniel: Dos Semifolgi del Codex 967’, *Aegyptus* 56 (1976), pp. 3–18.
- Schmitt, A., ‘Die Griechischen Danieltexte (θ und σ) und das Theodotionproblem’, *BZ* 36 (1992), pp. 1–29.
- Stammt der sogenannte ‘ θ ’-Text bei Daniel wirklich von Theodotion?* (MSU 9; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966).
- Vermes, G., *Jesus the Jew* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1973).
- Wills, L.M., *The Jew in the Court of the Foreign King* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990).
- Ziegler, J., and O. Munnich (eds.), *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum. Vol. XVI.2, Susanna, Daniel, Bel et Draco* (2nd ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999 [1954]).

The Additions to Daniel

Lawrence Lahey

Editions

(a) Standard Greek Editions

Göttingen, vol. XVI.2, *Susanna, Daniel, Bel et Draco* (Ziegler and Munnich, 1999; 2nd ed.).

Rahlfs-Hanhart, vol. II, pp. 864–69 (Susanna), 936–41 (Bel).

Swete, vol. III, pp. 576–85 (Susanna), 586–93.

(b) Other Greek Editions

Die Susanna (Engel, 1985).

(c) Modern Translations

NETS (McLay, 2007), pp. 986–90 (Susanna), 1023–27 (Bel).

LXX.D (Bergmann and Engel, 2009), pp. 1418–22 (Susanna), 1462–68 (Bel).

I. General Characteristics

The OG of Daniel incorporated three lengthy additions that do not have counterparts in MT Daniel: Susanna, The Song of the Three Holy Children, and Bel and the Dragon, all set during the Babylonian Exile. These additions also occur in the translation of Theodotion (see Daniel § I on the two versions of Daniel), and they may have occurred in Symmachus's translation (second century C.E.), but they were absent from that of Aquila (ca. 125 C.E.; cf. Origen, *Ep. Afr.* 2). As will be explored further, they are based on an exegesis of MT Daniel and, at least for Susanna and Bel, also on Jeremiah. They were probably composed in Greek as original parts of OG Daniel, and originated in Judea from a Pharisaic school that produced OG Daniel.

Susanna (Heb. ‘lily’) is found at the beginning of Theodotion’s version and seems to have been originally located there. In OG and Vulgate it is placed after ch. 12 (but cf. § V). Susanna is a beautiful, pious wife of Joakim, a wealthy Jew in Babylon. Two Jewish elders, however, become smitten with her. When she rejects their advances, they bring a false charge of adultery. She is convicted and is about to be executed when Daniel, here a young man, is inspired by God to question the elders separately. He establishes their guilt when they disagree concerning the type of tree under which Susanna’s supposed crime occurred. The elders are then executed.

The Song of the Three Holy Children (Song 3 Childr.) is a 68-verse insertion between 3.23 and 3.24 of MT Daniel that expands on Ananias, Azariah, and Misael, who are cast into the fiery furnace by King Nebuchadnezzar. They make a penitential prayer for the Jews in exile (vv. 1-22 [3.24-45]), calling God’s judgement just, but there is no prince, prophet, or (place of) sacrifice for mercy, so they ask that their petition function as sacrifice, for mercy and deliverance. In a narrative (vv. 23-28 [3.46-51]), God’s angel smites the flames where the three are, but those who stoke the furnace are burned up. All three in unison then praise and bless God in a hymn (vv. 29-68 [3.52-90]), exhorting creation to do the same, finally thanking him for their safety and his mercy.

Bel and the Dragon (hereafter, Bel) is probably the original appendix to OG (concluding the book in OG and Theodotion, but not in 967). First (vv. 1-22), Daniel is challenged at court by the king to accept that the god Bel is real because food left overnight at his temple disappears. Daniel exposes a secret entrance used by the priests of Bel and their families nightly to break in and eat the food, and accordingly the king has them slain. Secondly (vv. 23-42), the king points to a live serpent that is also worshipped, which Daniel overcomes by feeding it a ball of pitch, fat, and hair until it bursts. Therefore the king’s courtiers plot against Daniel. To avoid suspicion of conversion to Judaism, the king has Daniel cast into a lion’s den. On the sixth day, God’s angel takes the prophet Habakkuk to Babylon with food for Daniel. When the king finds Daniel alive, he proclaims the Lord God the only God, releases Daniel, and casts Daniel’s detractors into the den where they are eaten.

II. Time and Place of Composition

The apparent use of Jeremiah in composing Susanna and Bel indicates a unity of interest and source by the compilers of OG Daniel. Although an original Semitic text has been proposed for all three additions, it is more likely they were composed in Greek, since their style is the same as the rest of OG Daniel, and there is no anecdotal or manuscript evidence that they arose separately from OG Daniel. They were likely included in Proto-Theodotion early in the first century B.C.E., so they are probably earlier than that translation. At a minimum, they would seem to have been added to OG Daniel when the translation was made 135–120 B.C.E., but they were probably original compositions for OG Daniel. According to rabbinic sources, in the second century B.C.E. some idea resembling ‘an eye for an eye’ appears to have superseded Deut. 19.16-21, the law against false witnesses, among the authorities in Jerusalem. The false accuser was executed only if he were detected after an execution that he caused (Ball, ‘Additions’, vol. II, p. 329). The false accusers of Pharisee R. Simon ben Shetach’s son were discovered shortly before his execution, but he refused to be retried, saying: ‘Father, . . . use me as a threshold [for change]’ (*j. Sanh.* 6.3, Ball). His father (born ca. 125 B.C.E.) is quoted thus: ‘Examine the witnesses diligently . . .’ (*m. Aboth* 1.9, Danby). The concern of Simon’s colleague, Judah ben Tabbari, with those who influence judges (*m. Aboth* 1.8) also makes it likely that these issues go back before the last quarter of the second century B.C.E.

In antiquity there seems to have been some dispute regarding Deut. 19.16-21, the law against false witnesses, among the authorities in Jerusalem. The false accuser was executed only if he were detected after an execution that he caused (Ball, ‘Additions’, vol. II, p. 329). This system seems to be understood by the rabbis, where there is concern over the partiality of judges (*j. Sanh.* 6.3; *m. Aboth* 1.8-9). Susanna is well located in this environment: in Judea among Pharisees opposing the lack of application of Deut. 19.19—which is quoted in the conclusion to Susanna (v. 62). Likewise, Bel ends (v. 42) with Daniel’s evil accusers receiving the death penalty that they tried to impose upon him.

Alexandria has been proposed as the provenance of OG Daniel, but this is unlikely due to the emphasis of Susanna and Bel (apparently original parts of OG Daniel) on punishment of false witnesses, which marks it as a likely product of the Pharisaic school in Judea. Its Judean provenance probably also is reflected in the concern of OG Daniel, by modifying the MT, to glorify the Maccabean revolt as fulfilling the book (Pusey, *Daniel*, pp. 326–30). Susanna may also derive from an interpretation of Genesis 2–3, with a possible focus on legal matters that could suit a Judean setting (Pearce, ‘Echoes’).

The origins of the translation attributed to Theodotion are complex, depending on its connections with the actual Theodotion or an earlier ‘proto-Theodotion’ source. Theodotion seems to have produced his translation around 170 C.E., since it is quoted as the basis for Hippolytus’s *Commentary on Susanna* (ca. 200), while Justin Martyr (ca. 160) still appears to use Daniel of Proto-Theodotion, the theoretical lost translation that Theodotion revised. Proto-Theodotion can be discerned mainly from earlier quotations that resemble but also differ somewhat from Theodotion, reflected in the *kaige* tradition (see Schmitt, *Stammt*, pp. 11–16; Tov, ‘Relation’). Proto-Theodotion Daniel probably is already used by the book of Baruch near the turn of the first-century C.E. (Bar. 1.15–2.19 is dependent upon Dan. 9.4–19 that reflects vocabulary of the Theodotion translation).

The earliest description of Theodotion is ca. 185 by Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons (*Her.* 3.21.1):

‘Behold, a young woman shall conceive, and shall bring forth a son’ (Isa. 7.14), in which manner Theodotion the Ephesian translated, and Aquila of Pontus, both Jewish proselytes, and having followed these men eagerly, the Ebionites say that he was begotten from Joseph.

Two of Irenaeus’ statements, however, apparently contain polemical exaggeration. The Ebionites’ rejection of the Virgin Birth was well-established decades before Aquila’s translation. Quite plausibly Irenaeus uses further hyperbole to denigrate both translators’ identical renderings of Isa. 7.14 by duplicating the proselyte background of the infamous Aquila onto Theodotion. Indeed, Jerome (ca. 400) rejected the weak but prevailing proselyte tradition; apparently he never describes Theodotion

so, and more than once he describes Theodotion only as an Ebionite, claiming authority for it: ‘some (*quidem*) say’ (*Expl. Dan.* prol; cf. *Vir. ill.* 54; *Comm. Habac.* 3.10-13). Irenaeus’ ties to Asia Minor make plausible his notice that Theodotion was once an Ephesian, but as a sectarian Jewish Christian, Theodotion probably would have been based in Judea, and is likely to have reshaped proto-Theodotion there. Theodotion Daniel largely replaced OG Daniel among Christians by the fourth century.

The earliest description of Theodotion is by Irenaeus (*Her.* 3.21.1), bishop of Lyons (ca. 185). He uses hyperbole to denigrate both Aquila and Theodotion, duplicating the proselyte background of the infamous Aquila onto Theodotion. As a sectarian Jewish Christian Theodotion would have been based in Judea, and is likely to have made his translation there. It would have been at this point that the earlier proto-Theodotion would have been shaped and largely replaced OG Daniel among Christians.

III. Language

There is a recognised difference in style between the OG and Theodotion. OG tends to be more idiomatic, whereas Theodotion, as part of a translation tradition that conforms the text towards a Semitic *Vorlage*, tends towards stereotyped equivalents (see too Daniel, § III). While it is quite plausible that the Additions are actual Greek compositions, they may be written in Koine Greek that reflects Semitic interference, either because they are indeed translations or because they are using the style of translation Greek as their models or indeed using the LXX (see Joosten, ‘Prayer’). Thus, there is a high degree of parataxis and the use of Semitic calques such as *καὶ ἐγένετο* and *ἰδοῦ*. Hebraisms might, however, go beyond such interference and be manifest in misreading of a possible source text (e.g., Moore, *Daniel*, pp. 45, 82–83, 119–20).

IV. Translation and Composition

There is a natural relationship between Jeremiah and Daniel that contributed to the Additions: Dan. 9.2 says that Daniel consulted the book of Jeremiah for understanding, which would point Daniel’s readers back to

Jeremiah, while Jer. 29.22 speaks of Nebuchadnezzar using fire to punish, which would suggest Daniel's fiery furnace. That all three additions were composed in Greek by an interpretive school augmenting a first translation of Daniel accounts for their consistency of style with the rest of OG Daniel, and fits the concession by some scholars that there is no necessity for Semitic originals. Greek composition avoids the improbability that after being translated, the Semitic originals for all three disappeared quickly without a trace in the ancient evidence and even generated denial of such texts.

Although Susanna is practically unknown in Judean rabbinic tradition, the latter contains extensive material similar to Susanna's wicked judges, describing two leaders/false prophets, Zedekiah and Ahab, who are mentioned in Jer. 29.21-23:

Thus says the Lord of Hosts...: 'Behold, I will deliver them into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon, and he shall slay them before your eyes, and because of them a curse shall be used by all the exiles from Judah who are in Babylon, saying, 'May the Lord make you like Zedekiah and Ahab, whom the king of Babylon roasted in the fire, because they have acted foolishly in Israel, and have committed adultery with their neighbors' wives, and have spoken words in my name falsely, which I did not command them...' (NASB)

Susanna may well have borrowed its depiction of a woman preyed upon by two leaders from an already-existing Zedekiah and Ahab tradition. Such a tradition was already in circulation among Judean Jews ca. 240 C.E. with some reference to Susanna (see § VII)

Although older scholars inclined to Susanna's composition being in Greek, there has been a trend to propose a Hebrew or Aramaic *Vorlage*, with OG supposedly being a more idiomatic translation, Theodotion more literal (Moore, *Daniel*, p. 25). A Semitic Susanna is claimed because of the Judean provenance of the material, the existence of Aramaic fragments of a non-canonical Daniel story among the Dead Sea Scrolls, and the translation style (frequent use of *καί*, and Theodotion's use of the idiom *καὶ ἐγένετο*). None of these, however, bears much weight against Greek composition, and together only show the influence of the author's additional knowledge of a Semitic language or imitation of biblical style (cf. Joosten, 'Prayer').

In his correspondence with Origen, Julius Africanus supported Susanna's Greek composition and non-canonical status based probably on Jewish objections, including Greek word-play in vv. 54-55 (σχίνος 'mastic tree'/σχίσειν 'to split') and 58-59 (πρῖνος 'oak tree'/πρίσαι 'to cut') concerning the type of tree. Origen argued for a canonical Hebrew Susanna. Nevertheless, much investigation by one of the greatest scholars of antiquity, among Jews who in location and background should have been able to disclose something about a Semitic Susanna, produced nothing. He notes that Susanna's style is indistinguishable from the rest of OG Daniel. He was aware of apocrypha in Hebrew used among Jews, and he never found Susanna among these works. He had consulted 'not a few Hebrews' on Hebrew words for the trees in vv. 55-59, but could not discover anything (Origen, *Ep. Afr.* 1, 11-12, 15, 13, 6). If a Semitic text ever existed, it probably was long gone. Origen is forced to practically the same conclusion: 'the Hebrew Susanna... had been concealed among [the Jews] long ago (πάλαι)' (*Ep. Afr.* 12). Therefore, changes made to Theodotion Susanna a generation before Origen probably were not derived from a Semitic text. Instead they are similar to expansions and changes in Syriac Christian versions of Theodotion Susanna (collected in Ball, 'Additions'), rather like midrash. Likewise, such midrashic revision could account for Proto-Theodotion's differences with OG Susanna.

Both stories in Bel and the Dragon also seem to have originated from exegesis of Jeremiah. For its polemic against idols, Bel is developed out of Jer. 51.15, 17-19. In particular, the Dragon makes literal the figures of Jer. 51.34, 44:

Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon has devoured me and crushed me,
He has set me down like an empty vessel;
He has swallowed me like a monster,
He has filled his stomach with my delicacies;
He has washed me away...
And I shall punish Bel in Babylon,
And I shall make what he has swallowed come out of his mouth;
And the nations will no longer stream to him.
Even the wall of Babylon has fallen down! (NASB)

The consistency of the Greek style in both Bel and the Dragon, the smooth transition between the two in vv. 23-24, and v. 28 referencing Bel indicate that they are probably original parts of the same work. In

spite of concerns that the carrying of Habakkuk to Babylon by the Holy Spirit (vv. 32-39) is an interpolation, it functions to feed Daniel after six days in the den and thus also seems to be original, as supported by the opening OG subheading. It has been proposed that because Bel reintroduces Daniel, it originally circulated separately. OG Bel's beginning, however, gives the appearance of derivation from its claimed Habakkuk source, which intentionally sets Bel off as an appendix, and supplies the additional claim that Daniel was a priest. The story of the lion den is developed from, and ties Bel back to, MT Daniel 6.

Concerning Song 3 Childr., the two liturgical parts seem to be unknown in rabbinic tradition. Song 3 Childr.'s furnace story also may connect to Jer. 29.21-23, but MT Daniel 3 is developed. All three parts of Song 3 Childr. are tied to the furnace story, which suggests their unity of origin. Indeed, the beginnings to both liturgical sections are nearly identical (3.26, 52). This addition shows plausible use of the LXX, which would support composition in Greek. 3.89(67), ἐξομολογεῖσθε τῷ κυρίῳ, ὅτι χρηστός, ὅτι εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ 'acknowledge the Lord, that he is good, for his mercy is forever', occurs in LXX Pss. 105.1; 106.1; 135.1; otherwise, it may be from Greek Jewish liturgy. 3.27(4), πάντα τὰ ἔργα σου ἀληθινά, καὶ εὐθεῖαι αἱ ὁδοὶ σου, καὶ πᾶσαι αἱ κρίσεις σου ἀλήθεια 'all your works are genuine and your ways right, and all your judgements are genuine', apparently is based on LXX Deut. 32.4, ἀληθινὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ, καὶ πᾶσαι αἱ ὁδοὶ αὐτοῦ κρίσεις 'his works are genuine, and all his ways are judgements'.

The view shared by some scholars that OG Daniel is from the same translator as OG 1 Esdras (Montgomery, *Commentary*, p. 38) would strengthen the case for a school behind their production. Both books share noticeably good Hellenistic style, perhaps the best of the LXX. They also share verbal parallels, including an identical phrase whose verb and noun occur nowhere else in the LXX (Dan. 1.2; 1 Esd. 2.7): ἀπηρείσατο αὐτὰ ἐν τῷ εἰδωλίῳ αὐτοῦ 'he deposited them in his idol temple'. Gwynn notes that while 1 Esdras largely follows MT Ezra, 1 Esdras 3-5 is an interpolation between MT Ezra 4.24 and 5.1 that involves three young men at king Darius's court; thus in a work that already resembles OG Daniel, both have a lengthy interpolation set at approximately the same location with three young men, praise, and the king.

V. Key Text-Critical Issues

OG Susanna has 47 certain verses, while Theodotion's version has 64. OG 1-5a are textually uncertain, but Theodotion may have preserved them. The OG has no equivalent for Theodotion 15-18, 21, 24-27, 46-47, 49-50, 63-64. Theodotion lacks OG 51a, 62a-b. Theodotion also has rearranged OG 35a to 42-43. Approximately 25% of Theodotion's Greek is identical with OG (Steussy, *Gardens*, p. 35), and Theodotion's changes are generally seen as resulting in a smoother, rather than a different, story. Nevertheless important differences occur at the end. In OG, the elders were thrown by the people down a ravine and the Angel of the Lord cast fire on them; Theodotion only says that the people put them to death (v. 62). Moreover, OG 62a-b speaks of maintaining virtuous young men as sons, who will be a resource of knowledge and understanding. Theodotion 63-64 simply mentions relatives of Susanna who rejoiced at her innocence and that Daniel's reputation became great. OG here fits Pharisaic concerns consistent with the production of OG Daniel.

The original location of OG Susanna poses a problem. There are only three substantial witnesses to OG Daniel—the Chigi manuscript (88; ninth century) and the Syro-Hexapla (seventh century)—both of which descend from the Hexapla's LXX column. The third is designated 967 in the Chester Beatty biblical papyri, probably from the later second century C.E.; its text is non-Hexaplaric. The two Hexaplaric witnesses have an appendix of Susanna–Bel; 967's appendix has Bel–Susanna. Nevertheless, various factors favour OG Susanna's original setting at the start of the book, where it would emphasise the Pharisees' concern about false witnesses.

Because of the Hexapla's synchronised columns, Origen removed Theodotion's Susanna from the front and inserted it immediately before Bel. Did Origen thus rearrange an older OG appendix order, Bel then Susanna, as in 967? Text rearrangements elsewhere in 967 Daniel suggest its appendix may be the result of Susanna simply having been moved from the book's start to the end, which would gather both story additions and preserve the original position of Bel. In the Jewish *Apocalypse of Zephaniah*, written in Greek at the turn of the Common Era, Zephaniah prays to be delivered, even as God did for Israel (Jacob),

Susanna, and the Three Young Men (*Apoc. Zeph.* 6.10). Susanna's mention before Song 3 Childr. seems to reflect their order in OG Daniel.

Verses 1-5 of OG Susanna are mostly uncertain, although the two Hexapla witnesses contain them. They are marked in both with critical signs (Field uses a form of obelus, and the asterisk) whose meaning is no longer clear, and the verses agree exactly with Theodotion. Due to a marginal note only in 88 indicating that everything in OG before v. 6 was supplied by Theodotion, the critical signs are generally interpreted by scholars as confirming 88's note. The note, however, is inaccurate, since 967's text, which lacks 1-5a, probably predates and is independent of Theodotion, yet 967's 5b (περι...λαον; 18 words) agrees exactly with Theodotion. Therefore, Theodotion or Proto-Theodotion for 5b at least has borrowed from OG, not vice versa, and further marginal abbreviations in both Hexapla witnesses indicate exact or, as Field notes, substantial agreement between OG and Theodotion 1-5b. Because Origen never found a Hebrew Susanna, the previously mentioned critical signs seem only to indicate the lack of 1-5b in some OG manuscripts, similar to the lack of 1-5a in 967.

Small differences occur between the two versions of Song 3 Childr. in all three parts. OG lacks Theodotion 3.53, 85 (but cf. OG 84). Theodotion 3.24-25 and 46 are about half the length of OG. Although in OG Azariah is singled out before the initial prayer, his two companions join in; this joint recitation is like the hymn. In Theodotion this opening prayer is only spoken by Azariah. There are also verse rearrangements in Theodotion's hymn: OG 58-59 = 59, 58; OG 69-72 = 71, 72, 69, 70; OG 77-78 = 78, 77. In Jerome's Vulgate and in his contemporary Theodoret of Cyrus's *Commentary on Daniel*, however, they use a Syro-Palestine recension of Theodotion that restores OG order.

The length of Bel is similar in both versions. Theodotion has 42 verses, OG 38. Theodotion adds vv. 12-13, 25 (but cf. OG 26), and 29. Verse 1 of Theodotion sets the addition under Cyrus; instead of Theodotion's verse, OG has an opening inscription 'From the prophecy of Habakkuk, son of Jesus, from the tribe of Levi'. OG has lengthier vv. 9 and 17. Theodotion's Bel also shares about 25% of its text with OG, and has a less idiomatic style than OG.

VI. Ideology and Exegesis

All three Additions in their current positions in Daniel, not surprisingly, are somewhat intrusive in the original MT narratives (cf. Moore, *Daniel*, pp. 24–25). They offer little on their own for understanding their purpose and original audience beyond the proposals made in § II. Although Susanna and Bel are set during the Exile and told in a largely straightforward narrative (Susanna even provides details about her family), they are no longer viewed by scholars as historical. Moreover, unlike MT Daniel, they contain no apocalyptic themes, prophecy, visions, or their interpretations. Instead a connection of both to MT Daniel is through wisdom, and how it leads to the uncovering of the truth. In some ways Susanna and Bel resemble detective stories, since alibis or evidence are tested to determine guilt or innocence. Along with Song 3 Childr., they all focus on the theme of deliverance, emphasising the ultimate power and authority of God. This could be seen as a concern of Judean or diaspora Judaism.

VII. Reception History

The visions of Daniel were a popular source of interpretation in antiquity (cf. Daniel § VII), and, though comparatively less often cited, the Additions were popular as tales. 3 Maccabees 6.6-7 refers to the three youths and also to Daniel in the lion's den. The mention in this passage of God dampening the fire with dew provides the earliest reference (first century B.C.E. or C.E.) to the Additions (Collins, *Daniel*, p. 72). Josephus does not mention them in his *Antiquities* (Moore, *Daniel*, p. 24). The earliest Patristic citations (Moore, *Daniel*, pp. 28–29) are in Justin (*Apol.* 1.46, on the prayers from ch. 3) and Ireneaus (*Her.* 4.26, Susanna; 4.5.2; 26.4, Bel).

Origen (185–254 C.E.), apparently while residing in Caesarea, knew a rabbi's son, who said the names of the Susanna's elders were Zedekiah and Ahab (*Ep. Afr.* 7). Thus in Palestinian Judaism there was occasional notice that Susanna, which was rejected, bore some resemblance to the traditions about Zedekiah and Ahab. These traditions incorporated Jer. 29.22 and so were naturally mingled with elements of the fiery furnace from MT Daniel. In *b. Sanh.* 93a the two deceivers go separately to King

Nebuchadnezzar's daughter and claim to have a revelation that she should sleep with the other man; she goes to the king, and he inquires of Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah, who speak against the two false prophets, so the king has the two tested in the fiery furnace, and they are consumed. Thus in the plausible transformation of a wicked elders tradition for Susanna (cf. § IV), Daniel was a convenient choice to bring the climactic message concerning punishment of false witnesses.

Rabbinic tradition is only slightly better acquainted with Bel than Susanna. *Bereshith Rabbah* makes the connection between Jer. 51.44 and the Dragon (cf. § IV), but it is apparently not widespread enough to consider that Bel originated in Aramaic tradition. This is reinforced by an extract from midrash *Rabbah de Rabbah* published by Neubauer that quotes the entire Bel and the Dragon in a known Syriac version. The extract adds: 'The second history is not written in the Holy Books'. Bel is not considered canonical and thus may well have not been thought to have ever existed in Hebrew. Not even an Aramaic Bel was available: the rabbis here had to resort to a Christian version of Theodotion in a similar language, and Bel was obscure enough that it was quoted in full. For Daniel in later Pseudepigrapha, see DiTommaso, *Book of Daniel*.

Bibliography

- Ball, C.J., 'Additions to Daniel', in H. Wace (ed.), *The Speaker's Commentary, Apocrypha* (2 vols.; London: John Murray, 1888).
- Baverman, J., *Jerome's Commentary on Daniel: A Study of Comparative Jewish and Christian Interpretations of the Hebrew Bible* (CBQMS 7; Washington, DC: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1978).
- Collins, J.J., *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993).
- DiTommaso, L., *The Book of Daniel and the Apocryphal Daniel Literature* (Studia in Veteris Testamenti pseudepigrapha 20; Leiden: Brill, 2005).
- Engel, H. (ed.), *Die Susanna Erzählung: Einleitung, Übersetzung und Kommentar zum Septuaginta-Text und zur Theodotion-Bearbeitung* (OBO 61; Freiberg: Universitätsverlag, 1985).
- Joosten, J., 'The Prayer of Azariah (DanLXX 3): Sources and Origin', in J. Cook (ed.), *Septuagint and Reception: Essays Prepared for the Association for the Study of the Septuagint in South Africa* (Leiden: Brill, 2009), pp. 5–16.
- Montgomery, J.A., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1927).

- Moore, C.A., *Daniel, Esther and Jeremiah: The Additions* (AB 44; New York: Doubleday, 1977).
- Pearce, S.J.K., 'Echoes of Eden in the Old Greek of Susanna', *Feminist Theology* 4 (1996), pp. 11–31.
- Pusey, E.B., *Daniel the Prophet: Nine Lectures, Delivered in the Divinity School of the University of Oxford* (4th ed.; New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1885).
- Schmitt, A., *Stammt der sogenannte 'θ'-Text bei Daniel wirklich von Theodotion?* (MSU 9; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966).
- Steussy, Marti J., *Gardens in Babylon: Narrative and Faith in the Greek Legends of Daniel* (SBL Dissertation Series 141; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993).
- Tov, E., 'The Relation between the Greek Versions of Daniel and Baruch', *BZ* 36 (1992), pp. 1–29.
- Ziegler, J., and O. Munnich (eds.), *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum*. Vol. XVI.2, *Susanna, Daniel, Bel et Draco* (2nd ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1999 [1954]).

Index of Biblical References

HEBREW BIBLE/		11	23, 24	6.12	36
OLD TESTAMENT		11.10	18	6.16-20	32
<i>Genesis</i>		12.10-20	232	6.30	36
1.1	26, 365	12.11	231	10.13	32
1.16	226	13.4	18	12	36
1.27	25	13.14	493	12.48-49	36
2-3	558	14.14-20	232	12.48	36
2.2	21	14.19-20	232	13.16	78
2.17	524	15.6	25	13.18	31, 32
2.21-25	20	15.10	22	14	36
2.24	25	17.4-5	25	14.10-14	232
3	18	18.20-21	440	14.11	32
3.1	18, 19	22.13	18	14.13	440
3.9	19	24.12	18	14.21-29	232
3.11	19	24.25	106	14.30	232
3.14	19	32.29	440	15.1-18	30
3.16	19, 20	33.12	23	15.3	36, 232
3.20	18	34.2	232	15.20-21	232
3.23-24	20	34.7	228	15.22-27	31
3.24	18, 20	35.17	440	15.25	122
4.1-16	25	36.33	386, 388	16.17-18	226
4.1	18	36.34	386	17	36
4.7-8	21	37.17	23	18.3	36
4.7	17, 20, 21	40.8	80	19.1	29
4.8	22	43.8	23	19.13	32
4.13	17	45.1	106	20	76
4.18-22	231	49.7	430	20.5	77
4.23	17			20.6	73
5	23	<i>Exodus</i>		22.27	36
5.1-31	231	2.3	31	22.28 MT	36
5.3	23	4.2	81	23.20	391
5.24-27	231	5.3	23	24.10	36
5.24	231	5.8	23	25-31	35
6.4	493	5.17	23	26.18-22	31
8.14	482	5.20	32	27.9-15	31

Index of Biblical References

27.14-16	36	4.29	53	21.17	53
29.24	50	4.33	53, 55	21.22	53
29.26	50	5.8	22	21.23	49
29.27	50	6.18	54	22.15	53
32	38	6.31 MT	46	22.28	54
32.7-8	73	6.35 MT	46	23.4-8	92
33	33, 36	7	45	23.9-14	92
33.13-14	33	7.1	46	23.10-14	93
33.18-19	33	7.5	46	23.11	53
34	337, 484	7.24	49	23.15	49, 53
34.6	337	7.34 MT	49	23.17	49
34.24	391	8.3	80	23.20	49
35-40	33	8.4	80	23.27	46
35.22	50	8.27	50	25	45
36-40	30, 35	8.29	49	25.9	46
36	35	9.21	50	25.27	50
36.8-39.43	30	10.14	50	25.32	44
36.8	33	10.15	50	25.33	44
36.25-37.16	35	11	44, 46	26	46, 49
37.7-11	31	11.17	3	26.6	49
39-40	34, 35	13	45	26.7	49
39.1-31	35	14.12	50	26.8	49
39.2	50	14.21	50	26.25	49, 54
39.6	50	14.24	49	26.33	49, 54
		15	44, 45	26.36	49
<i>Leviticus</i>		15.2	47	26.37	49
1-15	45	15.16	47	27.21	50
1	35	15.17	47		
1.5	53	16-27	45	<i>Numbers</i>	
1.11-6.5	52	16	44	1	64
1.11-5.24 MT	52	16.2	47	3.38	29
1.11	53	16.14	55	4.3	65
1.12	22	16.24	47	4.42	63
1.17	22	17.11	55	5.18	106
3.2	54	18	55	8.24	65
3.8	54	19	46	9.16-23	64
3.11	53	19.18	44	10-14	95
3.13	53	19.31	76	10.1-10	94
3.16	53	20	45, 55	10.11-25	64
4.3	45, 50	20.2	47	11.9-10	61
4.5	50	20.6	76	11.29	64
4.7	51	20.27	76	12.12	388
4.15	54	21.6	53	12.15	65
4.16	50	21.8	53	14.23	96
4.24	53	21.10	45	15.3	47

Index of Biblical References

<i>Numbers</i> (cont.)		6.4-9	77	26.9	78
16.5	66	6.4-5	82	27.3	80
20.8	80	6.4	78	27.26	80
20.10	80	6.8	78	28-32	491
22-24	62, 90	7.8	72	28.7-36	72
22.4	62	8.15	70	28.25	75
22.5	63	9.6	76	28.36	72
22.6	63	9.13	76	28.58	80
22.11	63	9.14	82	28.61	81
22.15	63	10.2-4	75	28.64	75
22.27-29	62	10.16	76	28.69	70, 81, 82
22.27	62	11.4	70, 74	29.1 MT	70, 81, 82
22.28-29	62	11.18	78	29.9	75
22.28	62	12.29	81	29.10 MT	75
22.29	62	13.3	23	29.28	80
23.7	63	13.10	524	29.29 MT	80
23.8	63	13.14	23	30.4	75
23.19	228	14.16	3	31-33	69
23.21	65	16.18	75	31.1-30	69
25.8	60	17.14-20	70	30.1-10	488, 496
27.17	174	17.14	72, 74	31.9	81
33	64	17.15	72	31.11	81
35.9-34	91	17.18	69	31.12	80, 81
35.21	430	18.10-11	76	31.21	71, 79
		18.16	80	31.24	81
<i>Deuteronomy</i>		19.1-13	91	31.28	75, 80
1.1-5	69	19.14	81	31.29	97
1.5	80	19.16-21	557	31.30	79, 80
1.15	75	19.19	557	32	79
1.17	70	20.5	75	32.4	79, 562
2.24	72	20.8	75, 106	32.8	75
3.1	72	20.9	75	32.15	79
3.27	493	21.16	81	32.18	79
4.1-10	75	23-28	74	32.26	75
4.10	80	23.1 MT	80	32.30	79
4.27-28	525	23.2	80	32.31	79
4.27	75	23.17 MT	82	32.36	71
4.34	82, 475	23.18	82	32.41	79
4.45	78	23.34	231	32.42	106
5	76	24.15	345	32.43	79, 82
5.9	77	26.5-10	77, 78	32.44	79
5.10	73	26.5-6	87	32.48-52	69
5.14	77	26.5	78, 82	33.4	80
5.22	80	26.8	78	33.5	72, 82

Index of Biblical References

33.21	82	8.16	88	23.1	98
33.29	74	8.20	88, 94	24	94, 98
34	69	8.26	88, 94	24.1	97
34.10	80	8.30-35 MT	88	24.4	87
		8.30-35	96, 98	24.9	90
<i>Joshua</i>		8.32 MT	69	24.25	97
1-12	92	9.2	69, 88, 96	24.27	96
1	95, 98	9.14	97	24.29-31 MT	88
1.5	98	10	88	24.29-30	88
1.13	98	10.15	88, 93	24.31	88, 94
1.15	98	10.43	88, 93	24.33	87, 94
4.21-5.8	95	11.23	98		
4.24	97	13	88	<i>Judges</i>	
5	95	13.7-8	87, 91	1-2	104
5.2-12	95	13.33	88	1.1-2.5	94
5.2-9	92, 93	15.9	107	1.3	110
5.2-3	95	15.13	97	1.6	108
5.2	92	15.16	106	1.12	106
5.3	95	15.21-62	86	1.15	107, 109
5.4-5	92, 95	15.59	87, 91	1.22-26	114
5.8	91, 92, 95	16.10	87	1.25	107
5.9	95	17.4	97	1.34-35	87
5.10-12	93, 98	18.1	97	1.34	88
5.11-12	92	18.8-10	97	1.35	88
6	88, 95	18.22-19.45	86	2.1	111, 114
6.1-20	94	19.47-48 MT	88	2.6-3.6	94
6.2-25	90, 96	19.47	87	2.6	87, 111
6.3-4	88	19.48	87, 88	2.7-7.20	115
6.7	88	19.49-50	87	2.11-14	87
6.9	94	19.50	97	2.11	109
6.13	94	19.51	97	2.19	107
6.15	88	20-21	97	2.21	111
6.20	94	20	88, 91	3.1	114, 116
6.26	87, 94	20.4-5	88	3.7-11	94
8	88, 95	20.6	88	3.9	108
8.1-29	94, 96	21.2	97	3.12-30	94
8.7-8	88, 94	21.33	97	3.12	87, 111
8.9	94	21.36-37	87, 91	3.14	87
8.9	93	21.42	87, 98	3.15	108
8.12	94	22.4	98	3.18	110
8.13	88, 94	22.9-34	97	3.19	106, 112
8.13	93	22.9	97	3.22	108
8.14-17	94	22.10-34	98	3.23	108
8.15-16	94	22.12	97	3.27	108

Index of Biblical References

<i>Joshua</i> (cont.)		16.6-31	106	1.17	121
3.30-4.1	108	16.13-14	108, 114	1.18	120, 121
4.5	110	16.20	111	1.19	122
4.8	114	16.25	106, 108	1.20	124
4.11	109	16.27	106	1.21	124
5	108, 109	16.28	232	2-3	122
5.2	106	16.30	232	2.1	121, 122
5.8	109	17-18	104	2.2	121
5.10	116	17.3-4	113	2.4	121
5.16	109	17.5	109, 442	2.5	122
5.22	109	18.3	110	2.6	120, 122
5.23	114	18.6	111	2.8	122
5.25	108	18.10	108	2.9	120
6.11-24	114	18.14	109	2.10	119-21
6.13	111	18.19	111, 113	2.11	120
6.15	111	18.25	108	2.12	124
6.34	115	19.2	108	2.13	119, 121,
7.3	106	19.7	107		122, 124
7.8	107	19.19	106	2.14	121
7.21	111	19.30	107, 108	2.15	119
7.22	111	20-21	113, 114	2.16	120
8.8-9	115	20	94	2.18	120, 121
8.9	115	20.6	109	2.21	119
8.35	111	20.16	108	2.22	122
9.9	107, 114	20.26-28	108	2.23	122
9.11	107	20.40	113	3.2	121, 122
9.13	107, 114	20.42	113	3.7	124
9.17	111	21.17	113	3.8	120
9.24	109	21.25	111	3.9	119, 122
9.49	111			3.11	120, 122
10-14	105	<i>Ruth</i>		3.12	119, 121
10-11	104	1	124	3.13	119
10.8	113	1.1	120, 502	3.14	119
11.31	110	1.2	121	3.15	121, 122
11.37	113	1.5	119	4.1	121
13-16	112	1.8	120, 121	4.4	119, 121
13.3-4	110	1.9	121	4.7	119, 121,
13.5	442	1.11	120		122
13.22	111	1.12	124	4.8	121
13.25	115	1.13	120	4.10	119
14.6	115	1.14	121	4.11	122, 123
14.19	115	1.15	121, 124	4.12	122, 124
15.13	107	1.16	120, 121,	4.15	120, 121
15.14	115		124, 125	4.18-22	125

Index of Biblical References

<i>1 Samuel</i>		18.11	130	10	161
1-2	137	21.6	130	10.11	152
16-17	327	21.9	130	10.12	152
17-18	137	21.13	130	10.22	148, 159
17.37	232	22.19	131	10.23	159
17.45-47	232	22.51	139	11	156
17.50	232	24	128	11.14	443
17.51-54	232	24.10	131	12.20	151
17.51	232			12.24	148, 154,
25.3	231	<i>1 Kings</i>			156
25.20-31	231	2-14	157	16.26	148
25.32	231	2.11	128	17-19	157
25.33	231	5.12	426	17.1	151
25.34	231	9.15-22 MT	159	18.1	161
28.23	128	9.16 MT	87	18.15	151
		9.22	255	19.6	152
<i>1 Kingdoms</i>		16.34 MT	87	19.10	151, 161
1-4	137	17.17-22	159	19.14	151, 161
13.14	139	17.21-22	159	19.18	161
15.22	130	21.1-18	339	20	148
17-18	137	24.1	223	21	148
28.2-25	140	25.8-11	223	22	129
				22.28	152
<i>2 Samuel</i>		<i>3 Kingdoms</i>		<i>2 Kings</i>	
1.17	502	1.1	152	4	159
6	138	2-14	157	23.24-27	188
7.14	174	2-11	155	23.29	188
22.50	139	2.8	152		
		2.11	129, 148		
<i>2 Kingdoms</i>		2.12-21.43	129, 151	<i>4 Kingdoms</i>	
1.1-11.1	129	2.35	148, 154	1.7	152
1.1-9.13	129	2.46	148, 154	4.25	158
5.2	452	3.17	151	4.34	152
7.12	139	3.26	151	5.1-14	161
7.14	139	5-8	149	5.2	152
8.18	130	5.14	148	6.23	152
10.1	129, 130	6.1	29, 148,	8.10	152
10.2	129		152	13.20	152
11-12	140	6.9	152	13.21	152
11.2-3	129	6.36	148, 152	20.17	159
12.13	131	6.48	152	22.8-23	70
13.6	130	6.49	152	24.2	152
13.8	130	7.6	152	25	152
15.20	131	8.11	122		
17.28	345	9.9	148		

Index of Biblical References

<i>1 Chronicles</i>		18.16	174	<i>Ezra</i>	
1.11-16	168	20.18	171	1-6	181
1.17-24	168	20.22-23	170	1.1-3	179
1.27	168	21.13	170	1.1	187, 213
3.19-24	169	23.18	239	1.3	186
3.21	169	24.20-22	174	1.4-11	179
4.9	170	24.21	175	1.5	213
7.21-24	94	26.10	172	2.1-4.5	179
8.22	226	26.16-23	175	2.1-70	189
9.26	169	27.5	227	2.16	189
9.28	171	28.2	171	2.45-46	189
9.29	171	28.7	169	3.3	187
11.21	170	28.27-29.3	168	4.2-6	190
12.23 MT	173	29.8	173	4.5	187, 189
12.24	173	30.18	170	4.6-23	189
13	138	31.6	171	4.7-24	179
13.4	173	32.6	169	4.9-11	190
13.8	171	32.8	171	4.12	189
15.16	170	32.15	172	4.16	186
15.21	170	33	336	4.24	562
15.27	171	33.1	226	5.1-10.44	179
16.42	170	33.9	170	5.1	189, 562
17.13	174	33.10-17	339	5.17-6.5	190
18.17	169	33.11-19	168	6.22	213
19.19	171	33.11-13	337	7.6	186
20.6	171	33.13	336	7.23	187
26.16	169	33.19	337	9	336
28.3	175	34.14-35	70	9.6-15	213
28.12	169	35-36	181	10.8	186
29.11	170	35	188	10.10	186
29.20	171	35.1-36.23	170		
		35.1-19	179	<i>Nehemiah</i>	
		35.15	186	1.5-11	213
<i>2 Chronicles</i>		35.19	168, 188	2.8	213
2-5	149	35.20-36.21	179	2.12	213
3.4	172	35.20	188	2.20	213
3.5	172	34.21	187	3.36-37 MT	200
3.10	172	35.22	173	3.37-38	200
4.12	172	35.25	483, 502	7.6-73	189
4.14	172	36.2	168	7.7-73	179
5.1-10	408	36.5	168	7.47	189
5.6	171, 174	36.12	173, 483	7.72-8.13	179
5.13	170	36.19	186	8.1	191
9.1	175	36.22-23	179	8.4	186
13.2-22	168			8.5	186
15.5	173				

Index of Biblical References

8.9	191	4.11	209	2.9	386
8.13	190	4.13-14	231	2.11	387
8.18	190	5 MT	204	3.5	387, 391
9	336	5.1-2 MT	204	3.6	387
9.5 MT	200	5.3	218	3.10	390
9.6-37	213	5.6	218	3.16	388
9.36-37 MT	200	5.10	209	3.17	391, 395
10.18	189	6.1	215	3.21	390
11.12-35 MT	200	6.4	214	4.5	389
12.2-9 MT	200	6.9	206	4.21	388
12.25 MT	200	6.13	208, 215	5	390
12.29 MT		7.1-10	231	5.8	390
13.1	70	7.2	218	5.17	394
18.1	227	7.5	209	5.22	395
		8.1	209, 210	5.24	390, 394
<i>Esther</i>		8.2	209	6.4	394
1.1 MT	204	8.3	208	6.5	390
1.3	206	8.7-18	217	6.9	390
1.5-6	210	8.9	207, 210	6.14	394
1.5	210	8.11	214, 215	6.23	395
1.6	210	8.12 MT	205	7.2	388
1.13	206	8.13	214	7.15	390
1.17	209	8.17	210	8.5	394
1.19	207	9.1-9 MT	217	8.22	395
1.22	209, 210	9.5	214	9.3	393
2.7	231	9.16-19	217	9.12	388, 390,
2.8	209	9.16	214		408
2.16-17	231	9.26	216	9.24	395
2.18	206	9.28	216	9.26	390
2.20	214, 215	9.29	216	9.29	395
2.21-23 MT	204, 211	10.3 MT	205	9.34	390
2.21-23	211	11.1	224	10.13	388
2.23	214	14.3-19	224	10.15	395
3.1	206, 207	14.17	224	10.17	390
3.10	209	15.1	224	10.19	390
3.11	207, 210	16.13	231	11.2	388
3.12	210			11.7	394
3.13	210	<i>Job</i>		11.10	388
3.15	209	1-2	386, 390	11.12	388
4 MT	204	1.1	386	12-14	386
4.1	210	1.5	387, 396	12.5	395
4.7	209	1.17	387	12.6	390
4.8	210, 214,	1.19-2.1	396	12.12	493
	215	2.5	390	12.22	391
4.9	209	2.6-9	396	13.3	390, 394

Index of Biblical References

<i>Esther</i> (cont.)		27.13	387, 395	42.17	386
13.20	390	27.21-23	387		
14.1	388	28	387	<i>Psalms</i>	
15-21	386	28.1	387	1.5	328
15.20	395	28.3-4	387	2	330, 406
15.24	394	28.5-9	387	8.2	337
15.30	393	28.12-28	491	8.5 MT	325
16.6	390	28.14-19	387	8.6	325
16.9-10	397	28.21-22	387	9	389
16.9	390, 397	28.26-27	387	10	389
16.10	397	30.14	390	13.1	337
17.10	390	31.2	124	13.3	337
19.2	360	31.5	389	14.1 MT	337
19.11	390	31.11	391	14.3 MT	337
19.13	397	31.26	390	17.16	326
20.23	391	31.35	394	17.49	139
20.24	390	32-37	386	18	330
20.26	394	32.3	395	18.16 MT	326
21.6	389	33.1	390	18.49 MT	139
21.10	388	33.23-24	396	19 MT	330
21.15	124	33.23	390	20.4	337
21.17	390	34.5	390	20.6	337
21.20	394	34.10	396	21.3 MT	337
21.28-33	386	34.17	395	21.7 MT	337
22.3	394	34.17 MT	395	23.1	328
22.6	390	34.18	395	24.8	430
22.8	391	34.19	391	28.3	330
22.10	389	34.20	390	29.3 MT	330
22.12	390	34.28-33	386	33.9	430
22.23	394	35.14	395	33.13	326
22.26	394	36.14	390	34.13 MT	326
23.6	390	36.29-37	386	36.16	326
23.14	397	36.35	390	37.16 MT	326
23.15	397	38-42	386	44.9	322
23.16	389	38.9	390	44.45	330
23.17	391	38.41	390	45.8 MT	330
24.1	394	39.7	394	45.9 MT	322
24.7	390	39.10-40.13	396	47.1	328
24.8	395	39.29	390	47.4	322
24.22	390	40.20	345	47.11 MT	326
25.3	390	41.10	390	47.14	322
25.5	390	41.20	390	48.3	478
26.5-11	386	41.24	345	48.4 MT	322
27.5	390	42.2	388	48.11	326
27.7	390	42.11-12	396	48.14 MT	322

Index of Biblical References

50	140	137.1	325	8	353
50.12	326	138.1 MT	325	8.3	346
50.14	323	139.11	345	8.10	350
51 MT	140	140.11 MT	345	8.12	346
51.12 MT	326	144.9	430	8.14	346
51.14 MT	323	151	321, 326,	8.22-23	353
55.9	325, 326		327	9.10	346
56.9 MT	325			9.12	345
59	329	<i>Proverbs</i>		10.7	353
60 MT	329	1-9	491	10.10	345, 346
62.2	326	1	353	10.26	345
63.2 MT	326	1.1-24.22	348	11.13	346
68.17	430	1.1	341	11.14	346
69.6	376	1.2-3	344	11.31	353
71.4	346	1.8	343, 353	12.16	345
72	426	1.20	346	13.5	346
72.4 MT	346	1.21	346, 353	14.22	351
77.34	493	1.25	346	14.30	345
78.2-3	328	1.26	344	15.8	348
79.2-3 MT	328	1.28	493	15.22	346
87	491	1.30	346	15.27	346
91.1	328	1.31	344	16.19	345
92.1	328	2.3	350	19.14	353
93.1	328	2.11	346	19.21	346
96.7	325	2.17	346	20.5	346
97.7 MT	325	2.21	349, 350,	20.24	345
99.5	430		405	21.30	346
103.2	39	3.2	493	22.10	346
104.2 MT	39	3.4	353	22.20	346
104.38	29	3.11-12	353	23.5	345
105.1	430, 562	3.13	345	23.32	345
105.38 MT	29	3.21	346	24.8	346
106.1	430, 562	3.27-28	352	24.22	346, 348
107	329	3.34	353	24.23-24	348
108 MT	329	4.3-4	343	24.34	348
109.4	328	4.3	353	25-29	348
110.4 MT	328	6.6-8	352	25.1-7	347
113.1	29	6.20	343	25.28	346
114.1 MT	29	7.3	344	26.26	346
115.3-8	525	7.4	344	27.3	345
121.7	322	7.10	344	27.22	346
122.7 MT	322	7.11	344	28.16	346
134.15-17	525	7.12	344	28.23	345
135.15-17 MT	525	7.13	344	29.15	345
135.1	430, 562	7.16	345	30.1-14	348

Index of Biblical References

<i>Proverbs</i> (cont.)		8.11	359, 365	3.3	375
30.15–31.9	348	9.9	361	3.4	372, 375,
30.15-33	348	9.14	359		377
30.16	345	9.15	360	3.5	372, 375,
30.19	345	10.18	359		377, 379
31.1-9	347, 348	11.3	359, 361	3.6	375
31.1	343, 346	11.4	359	3.8	371, 373,
31.4	346	11.9	361		375, 381
31.10-31	348	12.2-3	361	3.9	375
31.11	226	12.2	359, 361	3.10	375
31.23	346	12.5	360	3.11	377
33	348	12.6	359, 361	4.1	374, 375
36	348	12.7	360	4.3	374, 377
		12.9	359	4.4	376
<i>Ecclesiastes</i>		12.11	359	4.5	378
1.1	366	12.12	359	4.6	375, 376,
1.2	363				378
1.3	359	<i>Canticles</i>		4.7	375, 380
1.9	361	1.1–2.14	381	4.8	375, 378,
1.12	361	1.2	375-78		379
1.13	360	1.3	374, 375,	4.9	375
1.14	361		377	4.10	375-77
1.15	359	1.4	374, 376-	4.11	375
1.17	364, 365		78, 380	4.13	374
2.3	361	1.7	374	4.14	376
2.6	359, 360	1.8	375, 376	4.15	375, 380
2.8	359	1.11	378	4.16	375
2.23	365	1.12	375, 378	5.1	375
3.5	359	1.13	375	5.2	377, 380
3.8	361	1.14	375	5.6	373, 375,
3.13	360	1.15	375		377
3.14	360, 361	1.16	375	5.7	371, 375
3.17-18	363	2.5	376	5.8	377, 379
3.21-22	363	2.7	372, 375,	5.9	375
4.8	359		377, 379	5.10	375
4.12	359	2.9	375, 377	5.11	376
4.16	359	2.10	375, 377	5.12	377
5.9	361	2.11	376	5.13	375
5.14	360	2.13	375-77	5.15	376
5.15	360	2.14	376, 381	6.1	375
6.3-5	363	2.16	378	6.2	375
6.3	361	2.17	375-78	6.4	375, 379
6.8	361	3.1	374, 375,	6.7	374, 377
7.7	365		377	6.9	381
7.26	359	3.2	375	6.10–8.14	381

Index of Biblical References

6.10	375	40.24	388	10.2-15	525
6.11	377	42.4	456	10.5	477, 524
6.12	373	42.13	36	10.24	478
7.1	377	43.23	360	11.5	491
7.5	379	44.20	402	11.19	477
7.6	374	44.28	459	14.7	476
7.9	375	45.1	459	14.11	478
7.11	20	46.6-7	525	14.12	491
7.13	377	48.14	459	14.13	476
7.14	371, 375	49.18	493	14.19	473
8.1	371, 375	53	403	15.6-7	482
8.2	377	54.6	464	18.11	478
8.3	375	56.7	462	18.14	476
8.4	377, 379	60.4	493	18.20-22	476
8.11	371, 372	60.7	462	19.15	476
8.13	378	62.11	452	20.2	475
8.14	375	66.16	444	20.3	515
4.12.6	375			20.10	515
		<i>Jeremiah</i>		21.2	482
<i>Isaiah</i>		1-29	440	21.4	475
1.2	462	1-28	471	21.5	475
1.11	462	1.8	482	21.7	475, 477,
2.2-5	445	1.17	476, 482		481
3.10	402	2.15	473	22.20	473
5.1	375, 379	2.21	476	221.3	475
6.6	462	3.26	562	23.17	476
7.14	465	3.52	562	23.28	476
8.14	464	3.67 MT	562	23.40	475
8.20	464	3.89	562	24.1	491, 492
10.24	458	4.1	476	25.6	491
15.2	462	4.2	476	27-28	484
16.12	462	4.19	428	27.39	403
17.8	462	4.29	476	28	216
19.19	458, 462	5.17	476	29-52	489-91
23.14	458	6.10	477	29-51	471, 472
25	326	6.25	515	29	471, 525
25.5	461	7.34	492	29.10	521
25.8	170, 326	8.7	476	29.10 LXX	509
29.16	464	8.15	473	29.21-23	560, 562
32.2	461	8.23	475	29.22	559, 565
36.3	458	9.5	476	30-51	471
36.22	458	9.11	475	33.15	476
40-66	491	9.13	475	34.1-18	470
40.3	452	9.22-10.21	479	34.9	255
40.22	39	9.24	483	34.36	491

Index of Biblical References

<i>Jeremiah</i> (cont.)	49.9	509		
35.9	476	49.29	515	<i>Ezekiel</i>
36.2	492	50.12	476	1-27
36.27	487, 497	51.4	561	1-25
36.32	487, 497	51.15	561	1-11
37.14	473	51.17-19	561	1.1-11.24
38.9	473	51.22	491	1.28
38.15	483, 484	51.44	561, 566	5.1
38.25	474	52	471	5.2
38.31-34	484	52.19	476	7.1-11
38.31	484			7.7
38.33-34	484	<i>Lamentations</i>		7.10
38.33	491	1	501, 516	10.2
38.34	484	1.1-2.20	500	11-17
38.40	476	1.1	483	12-39
38.44	474	1.3	512	12.25
39.1	475	1.15	513	12.26-28
39.2	477	1.21	511	12.26
39.7-9	478	2-4	501	12.27
39.7	475	2.4	507	12.28
39.8	475	2.7	513	13.1
39.12	478	2.8	503	13.7
39.17	473, 477,	2.13	509	16.4
	482	2.20	515	17.22-24
39.18	481	2.21	515	17.22
39.19	481	2.22	513, 514	17.23
39.20	478	3	510, 516	17.26-28
39.24	478	3.12	507	19-39
39.25	478	3.21	509	21.30-32
39.27	473, 482	3.22-24	509, 510	23.42
39.33	473	3.22	510	24.14
39.36	478	3.24	509	26-27
39.40	475, 482	3.25	510	26
39.41	476	3.29	510, 511	27
40.6	476	3.30	510	28-39
40.9	491	3.32	504, 505	28
41.5	476	3.42	511	31.6
42.4	473	4.1	506	32.25-26
43.3	478	4.2	506	34.23-24
44.2	491	4.14	509	36-40
44.18	491	4.20	432, 514,	36-39
46.1	475		517	36
46.5	515	4.21	509	36.23-38
49.5	476	5.19	511	
49.6	478	5.20	515	36.23

Index of Biblical References

37	536, 539	3.24 MT	556	5.11	548
37.1-14	539	3.24-25	564	5.14-15	549
37.15-28	539	3.27	562	5.14	548
37.22-25	539	3.29 MT	549	5.18-22	549
38-39	539	3.46	564	5.20	548
38	535, 539	3.50	293, 548	5.21	548
39	535, 536, 539	3.53	564	5.23	546, 551, 552
40-48	440, 530, 531, 539	3.85	564	5.24-25	549
40	536	3.95	548	6	546, 547, 549
40.7-8	530	3.96	549	6 MT	562
43.3	530, 538, 539	4-7 MT	546, 547	6.3	550
		4-7	550	6.4 MT	550
		4-6	547	6.5	550
		4-6	545, 546, 549, 551	6.6 MT	550
<i>Daniel</i>			545, 546,	6.12	550
1-6	388	4	549, 550	6.14	550
1-4	545		549	6.14 MT	546
1-3	551	4.3-6	549	6.15	550
1.2	562	4.6-9 MT	549	6.15 MT	550
1.3	546	4.11	546	6.16 MT	550
1.8	548	4.13	546	6.17-18	550
2-6	546	4.14	549	6.17	546
2	546	4.17 MT	549	6.18 MT	546
2.4	545	4.19	549	6.18-19 MT	550
2.6	80	4.20-22	549	6.20	546
2.8	546	4.22 MT	549	6.21 MT	546
2.9	546	4.23-25 MT	549	6.22	550
2.21	546	4.23-25	549	6.23	550
2.27	255	4.23	551	6.23 MT	550
2.29	552	4.26 MT	551	6.24 MT	550
2.31	548	4.26-28 MT	549	7-12	389, 551
2.35	552	4.28	549, 551	7-8	545
2.45	548, 552	4.29	546	7	546, 550, 552
3	336, 389, 547	4.30	549	7.10	552
3 MT	562	4.31	552	7.12	546
3.2	546	4.31 MT	549, 551	7.13	546, 551- 53
3.3	548	4.33 MT	549	7.21	552
3.3	548	4.34	549, 551	7.22	546
3.4 MT	562	4.37 MT	549, 551	7.23	548
3.5	546	5	545, 546, 549, 550	7.25	546
3.13	546		546	8-12	547
3.15	546	5.2	546		
3.17	551	5.3	546, 549		
3.23 MT	556	5.10-13	549		

Index of Biblical References

<i>Daniel</i> (cont.)		2.17 MT	441	<i>Joel</i>	
8	545, 550	3.2	443	1-2	449
8.5	530	4.12	444	1.8	449
8.14	546	4.15	447	1.19	444
8.15	493	4.18	447	1.20	441, 444
9	336, 488,	5.2-13.4	444	2.2	213
	489, 491,	5.2	449	2.6	442
	496	5.8	443	2.10-11	213
9.2	483, 559	5.11	447	2.12	449
9.4-19	213	6.1	441, 449	2.17	441, 452
9.5-19	495	6.2-3	449	2.21	440
9.5-6	489	6.6	452, 453	2.22	440
9.5	489	6.10-11	447	2.27	449
9.6	489	7.12	449	2.28-29	452
9.7-8	489	7.15	449	2.28	448
9.7	551	7.16	449	3	449
9.8	551	8.4	448	3.1 MT	448
9.10	489, 551	8.6	447	3.1-5	452
9.11	489	8.13	443	3.2	444
9.12-13	489	9.2	449	3.10	441, 449
9.15	489	9.3	443	3.11	449
9.17	489	9.7	442	3.16	447
9.19	548	9.12	447	3.18	441
9.24-27	550	10.4	448	4.10 LXX	449
9.26	550	10.10	449		
9.27	548	10.12	449	<i>Amos</i>	
10.11	548	10.15	443	1.1	447
11	550	11.1	448, 453	1.2	447
11.8	548	11.2	447	1.3-2.7	444
11.14	440	11.9 MT	449	1.3-5	447
11.22	548	11.10	449	1.3	442
11.30	550	11.12	449	1.6	442
11.31	546	12.3	440	1.9	442
11.36	546	12.5	453	1.12	443
11.40	548	12.7	447	1.15	447
12	545	13.2	447	2.7	448
12.1	552	13.4	442	2.14-15	444
12.4	546, 548	13.8	447	3.2	444
12.7	552	13.16	447	3.7	449
		14.3	449	3.11	443
<i>Hosea</i>		14.7	442	3.12	442, 447
1.3	443	14.8	443	3.15	441
2.1	452	14.9-10	451	4.2-3	442
2.15	441	14.9	451	4.2	441
2.16	448			4.4-5	447

Index of Biblical References

4.9	441, 448	4.2	446, 449	1.14	442
4.13	442, 448,	4.3	450	1.15	213
	453	4.9-11	449	1.16	441
5.5	443	4.10	449	1.17	448
5.14	444	5.11	255	2.1	449
5.25-27	453	7.1	509	2.7	447
5.26	444	7.8	448, 449	2.9	446, 447
6.1	447	7.14	444	2.10	447
7.1	448			2.14	441
7.8	444	<i>Nahum</i>		2.18	444
8.1	444	1.6	444	3.2	449
8.5	443	1.7	448	3.7	449
9.1	441	1.9	448	3.10	446
9.4	447	1.10	441	3.14	447
9.7	447	1.12	443	3.16	448
9.11-12	448, 453	1.14	442	3.18	447
9.11	440	2.6	441		
9.12	446	2.9-14	451	<i>Haggai</i>	
9.15	446	2.9	441	1.4	441
		2.11	442	1.9	444
<i>Obadiah</i>		3.4	255	1.10	444
5	509	3.8	442	2.4	444
18	452	3.10	441	2.5	443
		3.14	443	2.9	442
<i>Jonah</i>		3.19	441	2.14	442
1.2	440	4.10	441	2.16	441, 443
1.6	448	9.12	451	2.17	442
1.12	444			2.19 MT	449
1.15	444	<i>Habakkuk</i>		2.20	449
2	444	1.12	449	2.21	443
2.1	453	2.3-4	448		
2.4 MT	448	2.3	448	<i>Zechariah</i>	
2.5	448	2.6	444	1.1	174
2.7 MT	441, 448	2.11	452	1.7	442
2.8	441, 448	2.15	441	1.15	447
3	452	3	444, 445	1.21	447
3.5	453	3.5	443	2.4	442
		3.13	448	2.4 MT	447
<i>Micah</i>		3.15	442	2.5	452
1.7-8	447			2.8 MT	442
1.11	443	<i>Zephaniah</i>		2.11	446
2.1	441	1.2-3	447	3.1	442
2.2 MT	441	1.4	447	3.4	444
2.7	448	1.11	447	3.5	443
4.1-4	445	1.12	448	3.8	448

Index of Biblical References

<i>Zephaniah (cont.)</i>		1.23	188	<i>2 Esdras</i>	
4.19	191	1.24	187	1.1	198
6.12–13	443	1.39	186	1.4	197
6.12	448, 451	1.51	186	1.8	201
7.4	446	2	196	2.43	199
7.14	447	2.1-14	179	2.55	199
8.8	447	2.1-5	179	2.58	199
8.20-23	446	2.2	187	2.64	199
9.1	448	2.5	186	2.70	199
9.9	452	2.6-14	179	4	200
10.1	444	2.7	562	4.7	201
10.2	442	2.8	186	4.14	200
10.7	444	2.9	546	4.18	201
11.17	444	2.15-25	179, 189	4.23	201
12.10	447, 453	2.17	189	5.5	201
13.2	446	2.20	186	5.12	199
13.8	452	3–5	562	6.12	197
14.4	447	3.1–5.6	179, 182,	6.19	199
14.10	442		191	6.20	199
14.16	446	4.38	187	6.21	199
14.21	447	4.42-46	191	6.52	213
		4.52	186	7.9	199
<i>Malachi</i>		5.7-70	179	8.6	199
1.1	442, 449	5.7-45	179, 189	9.1	197
1.4	441	5.15-16	189	9.1	186
1.11	452	5.30	189	9.11	197
1.13	448	5.49	187	10.18	197
2.10	448	5.46-70	179	11.9	197
3.1	452	5.54-55	191	11.11	201
3.10	448	5.70	187, 189	12.8	197
3.11	523	6.1–9.36	179	12.12	197, 198
3.15	448	6.1-33	179	12.17	197
3.19	447	6.1	189	13.24-25	197
3.23	442	6.14	186	13.26	197
4.5	448	6.15	186	13.31	197
4.6 MT	448	6.27	337	14.2	201
		7.1-15	179	14.6	200
SEPTUAGINT/APOCRYPHA		8.1–9.55	179	14.13	197
<i>1 Esdras</i>		8.3	186	14.14	197
1	190	8.21	187	14.23	198
1.1-58	179	9.4	186	17.20	199
1.1-20	179	9.37-55	179	18.1	227
1.15	186	9.40	191	18.3	200
1.21-22	179, 188	9.45	186	19.5	200
1.23-55	179	9.49	191	19.12	197

Index of Biblical References

19.18	199	5.2	243	13	245, 253
19.19	197	5.4	243, 247,	13.2	238, 256
19.36-37	200		248	13.5	247
21.3	199	5.5	248	13.6-10	247
21.4-7	197	5.9	245	13.13	253, 286
21.25-30	197	5.10	253	14.2	240
21.12-35	200	5.13	245	14.3-7	239
22.2-9	200	6.8-12	256	14.4	242, 245,
22.25	200	6.8	238, 242,		255, 452
22.29	200		256	14.5	240
23.1	70	6.9	243	14.6-7	256
23.5	199	6.10-13	253	14.15	255, 256
23.9	199	6.12	242, 243		
		6.15	256	<i>Judith</i>	
<i>Tobit</i>		6.16	253	1.1	223, 228
1.1-6.12	250	7.1	243	1.13-15	229
1.1	248	7.8	257	1.16	229
1.2	242	7.9	242	2.5	226
1.10	245	7.10	243, 247	2.7	228
1.11	243	7.11	238, 256	2.13	226
1.16	254	7.12	253	2.21	223
1.19	254	7.14	257	2.28	226
1.21-22	223	8.3	256	3.2	225
1.22	243, 245	8.4	253	3.3	225
2	245	8.5-7	253	3.8	230
2.2-5	244	8.9-10	257	3.10	226
2.6	452	8.15-17	253	4.1	225, 230
2.8	244	8.18	257	4.3	223, 224,
3.6-6.16	246, 248	9.4	242		226
3.6	255	9.5-6	253	4.4-7	224
3.10	247	10.1	243, 247	4.5	226
3.11	250	11	245	4.6	223, 224
3.12	247	11.3-6	257	4.7	226, 228,
3.14	243	11.4	247		229
3.15	241, 251	11.5	257	4.8	225
3.17	256	11.14-15	253	4.9	230
4.5-19	253	11.14	247	4.11	226
4.5	249	12	245	4.13	225
4.6	247, 248	12.6-15	253	4.15	227
4.7-19	247	12.7	243	5.1	228
4.10	241	12.8-9	258	5.5-21	228, 496
4.12	242	12.9	241	5.5	223
4.15	241	12.14-19	243	5.8	226
4.19	247	12.19	242	5.16	226
4.20	242	12.22	240	5.18-19	223

Index of Biblical References

<i>Judith</i> (cont.)	10.5	233	16.22	233
5.19	225, 226	11.12	231	16.25
5.20	226	11.13	231	225
5.22	226	11.14-18	229	<i>Additions to Esther</i>
6.1	230	12.1	229	A 1-11
6.2	226	12.2	224, 231	A 12-17
6.4	226	12.4	229	A 14-30
6.6	230	12.5-6	230	C 1-10
6.9	226	12.7-9	231	C 5-7
6.12	230	12.7	229, 230	C 14-30
6.16-17	224	12.9	231	C 26-29
7.1-2	224	12.10-13.8	231	C 28
7.2	226	12.11	223	D 1
7.6-7	223	12.14	226	D 8
7.6	226	12.16	230	E 13
7.10	226, 227	12.17	229	F 1
7.21	227	13-16	224	F 6
7.23	227	13.1	229	F 11
7.30-31	229	13.3-8	229	216, 224
7.30	229	13.4-7	224, 231,	<i>Wisdom of Solomon</i>
8.4-6	231, 233		232	1-9
8.7	231	13.4	226	1.1-6.21
8.9-11	225	13.6	227, 229	1.1-15
8.9	229	13.8	223, 232	1.1
8.13	226	13.13	226	1.6-7
8.15	226	13.14	231	2-6
8.16	228	13.16	226	2
8.21	230	13.18-20	231, 232	2.12
8.24	225	13.18	233	3.9
8.27	233	13.20	225	5.16-23
8.31	225	14.10	231	5.23
9	213	15.1-7	224, 232	6
9.1	223, 225,	15.3	228	6.1-21
	231	15.6	229	6.1
9.2-14	224	15.10	232	6.3
9.2-4	223	15.12	227, 229	6.7
9.2	223, 228,	15.13	229, 232	6.9-16
	232	15.14-16.17	233	6.9
9.7	228, 230,	15.14	227	6.22-10.21
	231	16.1-17	231	7-8
9.10	231	16.2	231, 232	7
9.11	226, 233	16.5	233	7.2
10.1	226	16.9	227, 229	7.15-8.1
10.3	224, 230	16.11	233	9.5
10.4	230	16.21	225	9.10
				494

Index of Biblical References

9.15	408	32.12	413	1.13	496
10–19	405	32.12 MT	417	1.14	487, 490
10–12	406	33.13–36.16	349, 420	1.15–5.9	488
10	405, 406	34.9	417	1.15–3.8	336, 487, 488, 491,
10.15–11.16	38	35.8	417		496
11–18	402	35.12 MT	413	1.15–2.19	489, 495, 558
11.1–19.22	406	36.13	286	1.15–2.9	495
11.4	70	36.16	286	1.15–16	489
11.18	345	37.8	415	1.15	490, 551
11.21	408	38.1-15	255	1.16	551
12.3	405	39–44	411	1.17–18	489
12.4	407	40.24	258	1.17	489, 493
12.5	405	41.2-3	422	1.18	489, 551
12.12	408	41.19	417	1.19	489
13–15	406	43.5	417	1.20–22	488
13.17	405	43.19	418	1.20	491
14.6	493	44–50	422	1.21	489
14.27	405	44.20	421, 422	1.22	491
14.29	405	45.5	422	2.1-2	489
15.10	402	45.7	422	2.2	491
15.15	345	45.17	422	2.3	493
16–19	406	45.24	422	2.9	495
17.3	403	46.1-6	98	2.11-12	489
18.7	408	46.6	418	2.11	489
		47.11	422	2.14	489
<i>Sirach</i>		49.2	421	2.23	492
1.12	493	49.6-7	483	2.25	491
1.20	493	49.10	439, 452	2.27	496
3.9	416	50.27	412	2.34	490
4.22	415	51	411	3.1	490, 491
4.31	422			3.2	496
7.19	413	<i>Baruch</i>		3.4–4.4	491
8.2	416	1.1–3.8	471, 474, 488-92,	3.4	491, 492
11.20	420		487, 495	3.9–5.9	488, 492
13.9	416	1.1-15	487	3.9–4.5	491
14.17	415	1.1	487, 494	3.9–4.4	495, 496
16.17	337	1.2	487, 490	3.9	490, 494
24	488, 491	1.3	487, 490	3.14	493
24.6-8	75	1.4	492	3.23	493
24.10-12	494	1.8	490	3.26-28	493
27.30	430	1.9	490-92	3.38	494, 497
28.5	430	1.10	487, 490	4.1-4	488
30.25–33.13	349, 420	1.11-12	495	4.2	494
30.25–33.13		1.11	490, 495		
31.9 MT	417				

Index of Biblical References

7.41-42	232	2.19-15.39	274	11.22-26	274
7.42-43	232	2.19-32	277, 281	11.27-33	274
7.43-50	224	2.23	274	11.34-38	274, 276
7.44	232	2.26	274, 286	12-15	281
7.47	223, 232	3.1-40	282	12.15	98
8	263	3.5	309	12.20	279
8.1-32	268	3.18	279	12.43-45	275, 281
9-11	268	3.24-28	270	14	274
9.22	262	3.24-25	281	14.14	279
9.23-12.53	262, 268	3.27-28	281	14.17	274
12.1-23	268	3.30	281	14.37-46	281
12.24-14.15	268	4.1-5.10	282	14.45	279
13-16	268	4.11	276	14.46	275
13	263	4.14	281	15.12-16	483
13.1-16.24	262	4.17	277	15.20-36	275, 276
14.4-15	268	5.2	279	15.36	217, 218,
14.15	263-65	5.5	226		281
14.16-16.24	263-65,	5.11-6.17	282	15.37	276
	268	5.14	495	15.38-39	277
14.27-28	267	5.17-20	277, 281	15.43-39	281
14.41	328	5.24	267, 495	26.23	280
16.23-24	224, 263,	6-7	106, 313		
	264	6	274, 287	<i>3 Maccabees</i>	
		6.12-17	277, 281,	1.1-7	300
<i>2 Maccabees</i>			496	1.2	301
1	274	6.18-8.4	282	1.3	89
1.1-10	274, 279,	6.18-7.42	307	2.1-20	336
	280	6.30	313	2.25	300
1.2-6	279	7	274, 275,	2.26	337
1.7-8	281		281, 287	2.31	227
1.10-2.18	274, 279,	7.7-14	315	3.12-29	207
	280	7.28	287	4.17	337
1.10	276, 343	7.42	277	5.31	298
1.16-36	286	8.5-15.36	282	6.6-7	565
1.16	279, 549	8.22	274	6.6	294
1.20	279	8.35	287	6.8	452
2	274	9	278	6.40	229
2.1-18	286	9.1-17	277	7.1-9	207
2.1-15	286	9.18-27	274, 281		
2.1-8	483	10.7	229	<i>4 Maccabees</i>	
2.1-4	520	10.10	284	1	313
2.2	279, 521	10.19-20	274	1.1-12	311
2.7	286	11	207, 278	1.1-9	307
2.11-17	277	11.16-21	274	1.6	316
2.18	286	11.20	279	1.9	316

Index of Biblical References

11	435, 488-90	<i>Joseph and Aseneth</i>		<i>Luke</i>	
		5.5-6.6	330	1.5	175
11.2-5	435, 489			1.26-27	465
13.6-7	434	<i>Jubilees</i>		1.42	233
13.7	434	3.24	20	1.48	233
14.1	434	frg. C. 64	44	2.11	432
16	434			2.26	432
16.14-15	434	<i>Apocalypse of Zepheniah</i>		2.37	233
17	426, 428	6.10	564	2.38	233
17.7	428			3.32	125
17.12	426	NEW TESTAMENT		4.24-27	161
17.21	433	<i>Matthew</i>		11.29	453
17.27	430	1.5	125	11.51	174
17.29	430	1.18	484	12.27	161
17.32	432	1.23	465	18.20	38
18	429	2.5-6	452	21.27	552
18.1	432	2.15	453	22.20	484
18.4	434	2.18	483		
18.5	432	5	38	<i>John</i>	
18.7	432	6.28-29	161	1.14	497
18.9	430	9.13	453	6.31	38
		9.36	174	6.48	38
		12.7	453	7.38	380
PSEUDEPIGRAPHA		12.40	453	19.37	453
<i>1 Enoch</i>		12.42	175	20.22	517
5.7	40	19.4-5	25		
28.3	255	19.18	38	<i>Acts</i>	
37-71	553	19.19	44	2	330
48	553	21.5	452	2.16-21	452
103.3	315	23.35	174	3.12	316
104.1-3	315	26.28	484	7	38
		26.64	552, 553	7.42-43	452, 453
<i>2 Baruch</i>		27.9	453	7.45-47	161
29.3-8	213			7.45	98
		<i>Mark</i>		10.2	174
<i>4 Baruch</i>		1.2	452	13.16	174
6.3	124	4.32	539	13.21	139
		6.23	218	13.22	139
<i>4 Ezra</i>		6.34	174	13.23	139
5.5	452	7	38	13.40-41	452
8.45	452	10.6-8	25	15.15-17	452, 453
		10.19	38	15.23	309
<i>6 Maccabees</i>		12.29-30	82	21.7	139
127-130	313	13.26	552		
		14.62	552		

Index of Biblical References

<i>Romans</i>		<i>2 Timothy</i>		<i>2 Peter</i>	
1.19-23	408	2.19	66	1.3	316
3.25	55, 316	3.5	316	1.6	316
7.7	38			1.7	316
8.3	497	<i>Titus</i>		2.18	366
8.20	366	1.1	316	3.11	316
9.25-26	452	2.5	316		
11.3	161	2.6	316	<i>Revelation</i>	
11.4	161	2.12	316	1.6	39
13.9	38			1.7	552
15.9	139	<i>Hebrews</i>		1.9	316
		1.5	139, 174	1.13	552
<i>1 Corinthians</i>		2.14	497	1.14	552
1.31	483	4.8	98	1.18	552
10.1-3	38	8.5	39	1.19	552
13.8	172	8.8-12	472, 483	2.3	316
		9	39	3.20	380
<i>2 Corinthians</i>		9.1-2	39	5.10	39
3	484	9.22	55	8.7	39
5.1	39	10.16-17	484	8.8	39
5.21	55	11.26	39	9.20	552
10.17	483	11.30	98	10.2-4	330
		11.31	98	10.5-6	552
<i>Galatians</i>		11.32	115	11.6	39
1.21	309	11.35	288	11.7	552
		12.5-6	353	12.8	552
<i>Ephesians</i>				12.10-11	316
5.27	380	<i>James</i>		13.8	552
		2.11	38	13.10	316
<i>Colossians</i>		2.25	98	14.14-16	552, 553
1-2	26	4.6	353	16.2	39
				16.3	39
<i>1 Timothy</i>		<i>1 Peter</i>		16.4	39
2.2	316	2.9	39	16.10	39
3.16	316	4.18	353	16.21	39
4.7	316	5.5	353	18	484, 539
4.8	316			19-22	539
6.3	316	<i>Jude</i>		20-22	539
6.5	316	1.5	38	20.15	552
6.6	316				
6.11	316				